

Verifying Procedural Programs via Constrained Rewriting Induction

CYNTHIA KOP, University of Innsbruck and University of Copenhagen

NAOKI NISHIDA, Nagoya University

CARSTEN FUHS, Birkbeck, University of London

This paper aims at developing a verification method for procedural programs via a transformation into the recently introduced Logically Constrained Term Rewriting Systems (LCTRSs). To this end, we introduce an extension of transformation methods based on integer TRSs, which can also handle global variables and arrays as well as encode safety checks. Then we adapt existing rewriting induction methods to LCTRSs and propose a simple yet effective method to generalize equations. We show that we can automatically verify memory safety and prove correctness of realistic functions, involving for instance integers and arrays. Our approach proves equivalence between two implementations, so in contrast to other works, we do not require an explicit specification in a separate specification language.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: D.2.4 [Software Engineering]: Software/Program Verification; I.2.3 [Artificial Intelligence]: Deduction and Theorem Proving

General Terms: Formal Verification

Additional Key Words and Phrases: constrained term rewriting, inductive theorem proving, rewriting induction, lemma generation, program analysis

ACM Reference Format:

Cynthia Kop, Naoki Nishida, and Carsten Fuhs, 2015. Verifying Procedural Programs via Constrained Rewriting Induction. *ACM V*, N, Article A (YYYY), 54 pages.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/0000000.0000000>

1. INTRODUCTION

Ensuring with certainty that a program always behaves correctly is a hard problem. One approach to this is formal verification—proving with mathematical rigor that all executions of the program will have the expected outcome. Several methods for this have been investigated (see e.g., [Huth and Ryan 2000]). However, many of them require expert knowledge to manually prove relevant properties about the code.

Instead, we hope to raise the degree of automation, ideally creating a fully automatic verification / refutation process and tools to raise developer productivity. Indeed, over the last years automatic provers for program verification have flourished, as witnessed e.g. by tool competitions like SV-COMP¹ and the Termination Competition². Program

¹<http://sv-comp.sosy-lab.org/>

²http://termination-portal.org/wiki/Termination_Competition

This work is supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) international project I963, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), and Nagoya University's Graduate Program for Real-World Data Circulation Leaders from *MEXT*, Japan.

Authors' addresses: C. Kop, Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen, Denmark; N. Nishida, Graduate School of Information Science, Nagoya University, Japan; C. Fuhs, Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, Birkbeck, University of London, UK.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies show this notice on the first page or initial screen of a display along with the full citation. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, to redistribute to lists, or to use any component of this work in other works requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Permissions may be requested from Publications Dept., ACM, Inc., 2 Penn Plaza, Suite 701, New York, NY 10121-0701 USA, fax +1 (212) 869-0481, or permissions@acm.org.

© YYYY ACM 0000-0000/YYYY/-ARTA \$15.00

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/0000000.0000000>

verification is also recognized in industry, cf. e.g. the safety prover Infer [Calcagno et al. 2015] developed at Facebook or the temporal prover T2 [Brockschmidt et al. 2013; Cook et al. 2015] developed at Microsoft. However, these tools generally use specific reasoning techniques for imperative programs and benefit from the progress made in automated theorem proving over the last decades only to a limited extent. This suggests that there are likely to be avenues for improvement.

An interesting avenue to explore is *inductive theorem proving*. This method is well investigated in the fields of functional programming (see, e.g., [Bundy 2001]) and term rewriting, which is the underlying core calculus of functional programming. For a functional program f to be checked against a specification given via a reference implementation f_{spec} , it suffices if $f(\vec{x}) \approx f_{spec}(\vec{x})$ is an *inductive theorem* of the combined system of f and f_{spec} . For this initial setting, no expert knowledge is required, only the definitions of f and f_{spec} . Thus, the programmer does not need to learn an explicit specification language: it suffices to give a (possibly not optimized) reference implementation f_{spec} in the programming language they are familiar with.

Branching out towards imperative languages, recent works have also analyzed procedural programs (in C, Java Bytecode, etc.) via transformations into term rewrite systems [Falke and Kapur 2009; Falke et al. 2011; Furuichi et al. 2008; Otto et al. 2010]. In particular, *constrained rewriting systems* are popular for these transformations, since logical constraints used for modeling the control flow can be separated from terms expressing intermediate states [Furuichi et al. 2008; Falke and Kapur 2009; Sakata et al. 2009; Nakabayashi et al. 2010; Falke et al. 2011]. To capture the existing approaches for constrained rewriting in one unified setting, the framework of *logically constrained term rewriting systems (LCTRSs)* has been proposed [Kop and Nishida 2013].

Aims. The aim of this paper is twofold. First, we propose a new transformation method from procedural programs into constrained term rewriting. This transformation—which is designed to result in LCTRSs which closely follow the original control flow—will allow us to use the many methods available to term rewriting (which generally extend to constrained rewriting naturally) also to analyze imperative programs. Unlike previous methods, we do not limit interest to integer functions.

Second, we develop a verification method for LCTRSs, designed in particular for LCTRSs obtained from procedural programs. We use rewriting induction [Reddy 1990], one of the well-investigated methods for inductive theorem proving, together with a generalization technique that performs particularly well for transformed iterative functions. Although our examples focus on integers and statically allocated integer arrays, the results can be used with various theories.

The applications are many. Most importantly, the method can be used to automatically verify the safety of replacing one piece of code by another. Here, equivalence between different interface implementations comes to mind, allowing the user to determine automatically whether one implementation can safely be exchanged for another or whether a modification has changed the semantics of the program (see e.g. [Godlin and Strichman 2009; Lahiri et al. 2012]). Proposing replacements of equivalent algorithms may even be done automatically, in the form of algorithm recognition (see e.g. [Alias and Barthou 2003]).

Another example are optimizing compilers. Automated equivalence checking has indeed been recognized to validate correctness of compiler optimizations on a per-instance basis (see e.g. [Necula 2000; Pnueli et al. 1998]) or even once-and-for-all for a given compiler optimization template (see e.g. [Kundu et al. 2009; Lopes and Monteiro 2015]). Moreover, one can use equivalence checking in proofs of secure information flow (see e.g. [Terauchi and Aiken 2005]). In addition, inductive theorem proving can be used to prove safety properties, for instance to confirm memory safety.

Why LCTRSs. Direct support of basic types like the integers, and of constraints to restrict evaluation—features which are not available in basic TRSs—is essential to handle realistic programs. Compared to earlier constrained term rewriting systems, however, LCTRSs do not limit the underlying theory to (linear) integer arithmetic: we might use (combinations of) arbitrary first-order theories, including for instance n -dimensional integer arrays, floating point numbers and bitvectors. This makes it possible to natively handle sophisticated programs.

Despite the generality, we can obtain powerful results on LCTRSs by reducing analysis problems like termination and equivalence to a sequence of satisfiability problems over the underlying theory. In practice, automatic analysis tools—such as our own tool Ctrl [Kop and Nishida 2015] for rewriting, termination and inductive theorem proving—would defer such satisfiability questions to an external *SAT Modulo Theories (SMT)*-solver [Nieuwenhuis et al. 2006], as a black box. At the moment, this means the primary theories we can handle are integer arithmetic, the theory of bitvectors, the theory of arrays, and most recently also floating-point arithmetic [Brain et al. 2015]. In the future, advances in the SMT-world directly transfer to analysis of LCTRSs.

Structure. In this paper, we first recall the LCTRS formalism from [Kop and Nishida 2013] (Section 2) and show a way to translate procedural programs to LCTRSs (Section 3). Then we adapt existing rewriting induction methods for earlier variations of constrained rewriting [Falke and Kapur 2012; Sakata et al. 2009] to LCTRSs (Section 4), which is strengthened with a dedicated generalization technique (Section 5). We discuss techniques to automate the matter and results of doing so in practice (Section 6), and finally give a comparison with related work (Section 7) and conclude.

Contributions over the conference version. A shorter version of this paper [Kop and Nishida 2014] has been presented at APLAS 2014. The present paper provides several additional contributions:

- We supply a new method to translate procedural programs to LCTRSs, which was only briefly sketched in [Kop and Nishida 2014], and which significantly extends on earlier such translations (e.g. [Falke and Kapur 2009]) by supporting arrays and (both recursive and non-recursive) function calls. We further extend this method to allow for global variables, integer overflow and other error handling.
- We extend the theory of constrained inductive theorem proving to allow for *disproving* equivalence (following earlier works with integer constraints, e.g. [Sakata et al. 2009; Falke and Kapur 2012]) and add four additional derivation rules.
- We provide a strategy to simplify constraints by limited quantifier introduction, to instantiate fresh variables during applications of inference steps, and to automatically choose inference steps.
- We have extended the implementation, allowing users to automatically translate a subset of C programs into LCTRSs for analysis.
- We give correctness proofs and several more examples to illustrate our technique.

1.1. Motivating Example

Aside from business applications, the methods in this paper can also be used in the academic world; in particular, in student homework grading. When teaching a programming course, manually checking student assignments can be very time-consuming, especially since there are often many at once and the results tend to be unnecessarily complicated. One solution is to run the student programs on a set of sample inputs. However, while this quickly weeds out incorrect programs, it has a high risk of false positives. Alternatively—or in addition—we can automatically verify their correctness.

Example 1.1. Consider the following programming assignment, very similar to those given in the (early lectures of the) programming course in Nagoya University.

Write a function sum which, given an integer array and its length as input, returns the sum of its elements. Do not modify the input array.

We consider four different C-implementations of this exercise:

<pre>int sum1(int arr[],int n){ int ret=0; for(int i=0;i<n;i++) ret+=arr[i]; return ret; }</pre>	<pre>int sum2(int arr[], int n) { int ret, i; for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { ret += arr[i]; } return ret; }</pre>
<pre>int sum3(int arr[], int len) { int i; for (i = 0; i < len-1; i++) arr[i+1] += arr[i]; return arr[len-1]; }</pre>	<pre>int sum4(int *arr, int k) { if (k <= 0) return 0; return arr[k-1] + sum4(arr, k-1); }</pre>

The first solution is correct. The second is not, because `ret` is not initialized to 0—but depending on the compiler used, this error might not be noticed in standard tests. The third solution is incorrect for two reasons: first, the array is modified against the instructions, and second, if `len = 0`, we might get a random result or a segmentation fault. The fourth solution uses recursion, and is correct.

These implementations can be transformed into the following LCTRSs:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{sum1}(\text{arr}, n) &\rightarrow u(\text{arr}, n, 0, 0) \\
 u(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret}, i) &\rightarrow \text{error} \quad [i < n \wedge (i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(\text{arr}))] \\
 u(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret}, i) &\rightarrow u(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret} + \text{select}(\text{arr}, i), i + 1) \quad [i < n \wedge 0 \leq i < \text{size}(\text{arr})] \\
 u(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret}, i) &\rightarrow \text{return}(\text{arr}, \text{ret}) \quad [i \geq n] \\
 \\
 \text{sum2}(\text{arr}, n) &\rightarrow u(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret}, 0) \\
 &\quad u \text{ rules as copied from above} \\
 \\
 \text{sum3}(\text{arr}, \text{len}) &\rightarrow v(\text{arr}, \text{len}, 0) \\
 v(\text{arr}, \text{len}, i) &\rightarrow \text{error} \quad [i < \text{len} - 1 \wedge (i < 0 \vee i + 1 \geq \text{size}(\text{arr}))] \\
 v(\text{arr}, \text{len}, i) &\rightarrow v(\text{store}(\text{arr}, i + 1, \text{select}(\text{arr}, i + 1) + \text{select}(\text{arr}, i)), \text{len}, i + 1) \quad [i < \text{len} - 1 \wedge 0 \leq i \wedge i + 1 < \text{size}(\text{arr})] \\
 v(\text{arr}, \text{len}, i) &\rightarrow \text{return}(\text{arr}, \text{select}(\text{arr}, \text{len} - 1)) \quad [i \geq \text{len} - 1 \wedge 0 \leq \text{len} - 1 < \text{size}(\text{arr})] \\
 v(\text{arr}, \text{len}, i) &\rightarrow \text{error} \quad [i \geq \text{len} - 1 \wedge (\text{len} - 1 < 0 \vee \text{len} - 1 \geq \text{size}(\text{arr}))] \\
 \\
 \text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k) &\rightarrow \text{return}(\text{arr}, 0) \quad [k \leq 0] \\
 \text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k) &\rightarrow \text{error} \quad [k - 1 \geq \text{size}(\text{arr})] \\
 \text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k) &\rightarrow w(\text{select}(\text{arr}, k - 1), \text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k - 1)) \quad [0 \leq k - 1 < \text{size}(\text{arr})] \\
 w(n, \text{error}) &\rightarrow \text{error} \\
 w(n, \text{return}(a, r)) &\rightarrow \text{return}(a, n + r)
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that arrays in LCTRSs carry an implicit size (their allocated memory) which is queried inside the LCTRS to model the runtime behavior of the C program; this is used to automatically check for out-of-bound errors. Note also the use of a fresh variable in

the right-hand side of the `sum2` rule, modeling that the third parameter of `u` is assigned an *arbitrary* integer. The details of these transformations are discussed in Section 3.

Using inductive theorem proving, we can now prove:

$$\forall arr \in \text{array}(\text{int}). \forall len \in \text{int}. \text{sum1}(arr, len) \leftrightarrow^* \text{sum4}(arr, len) \text{ if } 0 \leq len \leq \text{size}(arr)$$

That is, the functions `sum1` and `sum4`, given input that satisfies the precondition for the function (the given length does not cause out-of-bound errors), return the same result.

We can also use inductive theorem proving to find that:

$$\exists arr \in \text{array}(\text{int}). \exists len \in \text{int}. \text{sum3}(arr, len) \not\leftrightarrow^* \text{sum4}(arr, len) \text{ with } 0 \leq len \leq \text{size}(arr)$$

So `sum3` does not define the same function as `sum1` and `sum4`.³ Clearly, both results are useful when marking assignments. For `sum2`, we *do* have $\text{sum2}(arr, len) \leftrightarrow^* \text{sum4}(arr, len)$, since it is indeed possible to reduce `sum2` and `sum4` to the same normal form (by choosing to instantiate `ret` with 0 in the first step reducing $\text{sum2}(arr, len)$). However, this system is not confluent; we can also prove that there exist a, n such that $\text{sum2}(a, n) \rightarrow^* s \neq t \leftarrow^* \text{sum4}(a, n)$ for terms s, t in normal form. As explained in Section 6, we will use a strategy which typically proves only the latter.

1.2. Practical Use

The primary application that we see for our technique is the following:

Comparing a function to a specification. As we did in Example 1.1, we can verify correctness of a C-function `f` against a reference implementation `g` as follows:

- use the approach from Example 1.1 to translate both functions to LCTRS rules;
- show that $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx g(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ $[\text{true}]$ is an inductive theorem.

If we only need equivalence under given preconditions of the input variables—such as the precondition in Example 1.1 that the given array length is at most the declared size of the array—such preconditions should be formulated as a constraint φ (e.g. $\varphi := len \leq \text{size}(arr)$), and the proof obligation is weakened to $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx g(x_1, \dots, x_n) [\varphi]$ being an inductive theorem. A great advantage of this approach is that we do not require a separate specification language for reference implementations—although if desirable, it is of course possible to specify the reference directly as an LCTRS.

Further possible applications of our technique include:

Code optimization (or other improvement). Sometimes the “reference implementation” `g` suggested above can simply be an existing—and inefficient, or inelegant—version of a function. Thus, inductive theorem proving can be used to prove that it is safe to replace a function in a large real-life program by an optimized alternative.

Error checking. Since the transformation from C to LCTRSs includes error checking (as demonstrated for memory safety violations in Example 1.1), we can use inductive theorem proving to check for the absence of such errors. This is done by introducing error-checking rules, such as

$$\text{errorfree}(\text{return}(a, n)) \rightarrow \text{true} \qquad \text{errorfree}(\text{error}) \rightarrow \text{false}$$

and then proving that the equation $\text{errorfree}(\text{sum4}(a, n)) \approx \text{true} [n \leq \text{size}(a)]$ is an inductive theorem. Here, $n \leq \text{size}(a)$ is the precondition on the input.

Aside from memory safety, this approach can be used to certify the absence of other problems, such as division by zero or even integer overflow. The key is in the transformation method, where we can choose which constructions should result in an error.

³It seems likely that the disproof thus obtained could be used to extract counterexample inputs. However, at present we have not studied a systematic way of doing so.

Classical correctness checks. Aside from comparisons to an example implementation, we can also specify a correctness property directly in SMT. For instance, given an implementation of the `strlen` function, its correctness could be verified by proving that

$$\text{strlen}(x) \approx \text{return}(n) \ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0]]$$

is an inductive theorem. Alternatively, we can use extra rules—much like the errorfree rules above—to test properties in SMT. For example, to analyze whether an implementation of `strcpy` is correct, we may introduce the following rules:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{test}(x, n, \text{error}) &\rightarrow \text{false} \\ \text{test}(x, n, \text{return}(y)) &\rightarrow b \ [b \Leftrightarrow \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n\} [\text{select}(x, i) = \text{select}(y, i)]] \end{aligned}$$

And prove that the following equation is an inductive theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{test}(x, n, \text{strcpy}(y, x)) \approx \text{true} \\ &[0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0]] \end{aligned}$$

Note that this more sophisticated test is *needed* in this case, since correctness of `strcpy` does not require that $x = y$ if $\text{strcpy}(x) \rightarrow^* \text{return}(y)$ (the sizes of x and y may differ).

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we briefly recall *Logically Constrained Term Rewriting Systems* (usually abbreviated as *LCTRSs*), following the definitions in [Kop and Nishida 2013].

2.1. Logically Constrained Term Rewriting Systems

Many-sorted terms. We assume given a set S of *sorts* and an infinite set $\mathcal{V}$ of *variables*, each variable equipped with a sort. A *signature* Σ is a set of *function symbols* f , disjoint from $\mathcal{V}$, each equipped with a *sort declaration* $[\iota_1 \times \dots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa$, with all ι_i and κ sorts. For readability, we often write κ instead of $[\] \Rightarrow \kappa$. The set $\text{Terms}(\Sigma, \mathcal{V})$ of *terms* over Σ and $\mathcal{V}$ contains any expression s such that $\vdash s : \iota$ can be derived for some sort ι , using:

$$\frac{}{\vdash x : \iota} \ (x : \iota \in \mathcal{V}) \qquad \frac{\vdash s_1 : \iota_1 \ \dots \ \vdash s_n : \iota_n}{\vdash f(s_1, \dots, s_n) : \kappa} \ (f : [\iota_1 \times \dots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \Sigma)$$

For fixed Σ and $\mathcal{V}$, each term s has a unique sort ι with $\vdash s : \iota$; we say that ι is the sort of s . Let $\text{Var}(s)$ be the set of variables occurring in s . A term s is *ground* if $\text{Var}(s) = \emptyset$. A *substitution* γ is a sort-preserving total mapping $[x_1 := s_1, \dots, x_k := s_k]$ from $\mathcal{V}$ to $\text{Terms}(\Sigma, \mathcal{V})$ where $\gamma(y) = s_i$ if $y = x_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $\gamma(y) = y$ otherwise. The result $s\gamma$ of applying a substitution γ to a term s is s with all occurrences of any x_i replaced by s_i . The *domain* of this substitution, $\text{Dom}(\gamma)$, is the set $\{x_i \mid x_i \neq s_i\}$.

Given a term s , a *position* in s is a sequence p of positive integers such that $s|_p$ is defined, where $s|_\epsilon = s$ and $f(s_1, \dots, s_n)|_{i.p} = (s_i)|_p$. We call $s|_p$ a *subterm* of s . If $\vdash s|_p : \iota$ and $\vdash t : \iota$, then $s[t]_p$ denotes s with the subterm at position p replaced by t . A *context* C is a term containing one or more typed *holes* $\square_i : \iota_i$. If $s_1 : \iota_1, \dots, s_n : \iota_n$, we define $C[s_1, \dots, s_n]$ as C with each $\square_i$ replaced by s_i .

Logical terms. We fix a signature $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{terms}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{theory}}$ (with possible overlap, as discussed below). The sorts occurring in Σ_{theory} are called *theory sorts*, and the symbols *theory symbols*. We assume given a mapping $\mathcal{I}$ which assigns to each theory sort ι a set $\mathcal{I}_\iota$, and a mapping $\mathcal{J}$ which maps each $f : [\iota_1 \times \dots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \Sigma_{\text{theory}}$ to a function $\mathcal{J}_f$ in $\mathcal{I}_{\iota_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{I}_{\iota_n} \Rightarrow \mathcal{I}_\kappa$. For all theory sorts ι we also fix a set $\mathcal{Val}_\iota \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{theory}}$ of *values*: function symbols $a : [\] \Rightarrow \iota$, where $\mathcal{J}$ gives a bijective mapping from $\mathcal{Val}_\iota$ to $\mathcal{I}_\iota$. We require that $\Sigma_{\text{terms}} \cap \Sigma_{\text{theory}} \subseteq \mathcal{Val} = \bigcup_\iota \mathcal{Val}_\iota$.

A term in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{terms}}(\Sigma_{\text{theory}}, \mathcal{V})$ is called a *logical term*. For ground logical terms, let $\llbracket f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \rrbracket := \mathcal{J}_f(\llbracket s_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket s_n \rrbracket)$. Every ground logical term s corresponds to a unique value c such that $\llbracket s \rrbracket = \llbracket c \rrbracket$; we say that c is the value of s . A *constraint* is a logical term φ of some sort bool with $\mathcal{I}_{\text{bool}} = \mathbb{B} = \{\top, \perp\}$, the set of *booleans*. We say φ is *valid* if $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = \top$ for *all* substitutions γ which map $\text{Var}(\varphi)$ to values, and *satisfiable* if $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = \top$ for *some* substitutions γ which map $\text{Var}(\varphi)$ to values. A substitution γ *respects* φ if $\gamma(x)$ is a value for all $x \in \text{Var}(\varphi)$ and $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = \top$.

Formally, terms in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{terms}}(\Sigma_{\text{terms}}, \mathcal{V})$ have no special function, but we see them as the primary objects of our term rewriting systems: a reduction would typically begin and end with such terms, with elements of $\Sigma_{\text{theory}} \setminus \mathcal{V}$ (also called *calculation symbols*) only used in intermediate terms. Their function is to perform calculations in the underlying theory. Usually, values which are expected to occur in starting terms and end terms should be included both in Σ_{terms} and Σ_{theory} , while values only used in constraints and calculations would only be in Σ_{theory} ; true and false often fall in the latter category.

We typically choose a theory signature with $\Sigma_{\text{theory}} \supseteq \Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{core}}$, where $\Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{core}}$ contains the core theory symbols: $\text{true}, \text{false} : \text{bool}$, $\wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow : [\text{bool} \times \text{bool}] \Rightarrow \text{bool}$, $\neg : [\text{bool}] \Rightarrow \text{bool}$, and, for all theory sorts ι , symbols $=_\iota, \neq_\iota : [\iota \times \iota] \Rightarrow \text{bool}$, and an evaluation function $\mathcal{J}$ that interprets these symbols as expected. We omit the sort subscripts from $=$ and $\neq$ when they can be derived from the context.

The standard integer signature $\Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{int}}$ is $\Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{core}} \cup \{+, -, *, \text{exp}, \text{div}, \text{mod} : [\text{int} \times \text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{int}; \leq, < : [\text{int} \times \text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{bool}\} \cup \{n : \text{int} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Here, values are true, false and n for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, we use n (written in sans-serif font) as the function symbol corresponding to the set element $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (written in *math* font). We let $\mathcal{J}$ be defined in the natural way, with one alteration: since all $\mathcal{J}_f$ are required to be total functions, we define $\mathcal{J}_{\text{div}}(n, 0) = \mathcal{J}_{\text{mod}}(n, 0) = \mathcal{J}_{\text{exp}}(n, k) = 0$ for all n and all $k < 0$. Of course, when constructing LCTRSs, we normally perform explicit error checks to avoid such calls.

Example 2.1. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{int}, \text{bool}\}$, and consider the signature $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{terms}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{theory}}$, where $\Sigma_{\text{theory}} = \Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{int}}$ as described above, and

$$\Sigma_{\text{terms}} = \{ \text{fact} : [\text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{int} \} \cup \{ n : \text{int} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z} \}$$

Then both int and bool are theory sorts. In order for the theory signature to be meaningful, we also define set and function interpretations, i.e. $\mathcal{I}_{\text{int}} = \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathcal{I}_{\text{bool}} = \mathbb{B}$, and $\mathcal{J}$ is defined as discussed above. Writing $=$ for $=_{\text{int}}$ and using infix notation, examples of logical terms are $0 = 0 + -1$ and $x + 3 \geq y + -42$. Both are constraints. $5 + 9$ is also a (ground) logical term, but not a constraint. Expected starting terms are e.g. $\text{fact}(42)$ or $\text{fact}(\text{fact}(-4))$: ground terms fully built using symbols in Σ_{terms} .

Rules and rewriting. A rule is a triple $\ell \rightarrow r [\varphi]$ where ℓ and r are terms of the same sort and φ is a constraint. Here, ℓ is not a logical term (so also not a variable, as all variables are elements of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{terms}}(\Sigma_{\text{theory}}, \mathcal{V})$). If $\varphi = \text{true}$ with $\mathcal{J}(\text{true}) = \top$, the rule is usually just denoted $\ell \rightarrow r$. We define $L\text{Var}(\ell \rightarrow r [\varphi])$ as $\text{Var}(\varphi) \cup (\text{Var}(r) \setminus \text{Var}(\ell))$. A substitution γ *respects* $\ell \rightarrow r [\varphi]$ if $\gamma(x)$ is a value for all $x \in L\text{Var}(\ell \rightarrow r [\varphi])$, and $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = \top$. Note that it is allowed to have $\text{Var}(r) \not\subseteq \text{Var}(\ell)$, but fresh variables in the right-hand side may only be instantiated with *values*. This is done to model user input or random choice, both of which would typically produce a value. Variables in the left-hand sides do not need to be instantiated with values (unless they also occur in the constraint); this is needed for instance to support a lazy evaluation strategy.

We assume given a set of rules $\mathcal{R}$ and let $\mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$ be the set $\{f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow y \mid y = f(\vec{x})\} \cup \{f : [\iota_1 \times \dots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \Sigma_{\text{theory}} \setminus \mathcal{V}\}$ (writing $\vec{x}$ for $x_1, \dots, x_n$); we will usually call the elements of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$ *rules*—or *calculation rules*—even though their left-hand side

is a logical term. The *rewrite relation* $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a binary relation on terms, defined by:

$$C[\ell\gamma] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} C[r\gamma] \text{ if } \ell \rightarrow r \text{ } [\varphi] \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}} \text{ and } \gamma \text{ respects } \ell \rightarrow r \text{ } [\varphi]$$

We say that the reduction occurs at position p if $C = C[\square]_p$. Let $s \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t$ if $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t$ or $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s$. A reduction step with $\mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$ is called a *calculation*. A term is in *normal form* if it cannot be reduced with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$. If $f(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n) \rightarrow r \text{ } [\varphi] \in \mathcal{R}$ we call f a *defined symbol*; non-defined elements of Σ_{terms} and all values are *constructors*. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of all defined symbols, and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ons}}$ the set of all constructors. A term in $\text{Terms}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{ons}}, \mathcal{V})$ is called a *constructor term*. A *logically constrained term rewriting system* (LCTRS) is defined as the abstract rewriting system $(\text{Terms}(\Sigma, \mathcal{V}), \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}})$, and usually given by supplying Σ , $\mathcal{R}$, and also $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ if these are not clear from context.

Example 2.2. To implement an LCTRS calculating the *factorial* function, we use the signature Σ from Example 2.1, and the following rules:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{fact}} = \{ \text{fact}(x) \rightarrow 1 \text{ } [x \leq 0] \text{ , } \text{fact}(x) \rightarrow x * \text{fact}(x - 1) \text{ } [\neg(x \leq 0)] \}$$

Using calculation steps, a term $3 - 1$ reduces to 2 in one step (using the calculation rule $x - y \rightarrow z \text{ } [z = x - y]$), and $3 * (2 * (1 * 1))$ reduces to 6 in three steps. Using also the rules in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{fact}}$, $\text{fact}(3)$ reduces in ten steps to 6.

Example 2.3. To implement an LCTRS calculating the sum of elements in an array, let $\mathcal{I}_{\text{bool}} = \mathbb{B}$, $\mathcal{I}_{\text{int}} = \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathcal{I}_{\text{array}(\text{int})} = \mathbb{Z}^*$, so $\text{array}(\text{int})$ is mapped to finite-length integer sequences. Let $\Sigma_{\text{theory}} = \Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{int}} \cup \{ \text{size} : [\text{array}(\text{int})] \Rightarrow \text{int}, \text{select} : [\text{array}(\text{int}) \times \text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{int} \} \cup \{ a \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}^* \}$. (We do *not* encode arrays as lists: every “array”—integer sequence— a corresponds to a unique symbol a .) The interpretation function $\mathcal{J}$ behaves on $\Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{int}}$ as usual, maps the values a to the corresponding integer sequence, and has:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\text{size}}(a) &= k \text{ if } a = \langle n_0, \dots, n_{k-1} \rangle \\ \mathcal{J}_{\text{select}}(a, i) &= n_i \text{ if } a = \langle n_0, \dots, n_{k-1} \rangle \text{ with } 0 \leq i < k \\ &= 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

In addition, let:

$$\Sigma_{\text{terms}} = \{ \text{sum} : [\text{array}(\text{int})] \Rightarrow \text{int}, \text{sum0} : [\text{array}(\text{int}) \times \text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{int} \} \cup \{ n : \text{int} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z} \} \cup \{ a \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}^* \}$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{sum}(x) \rightarrow \text{sum0}(x, \text{size}(x) - 1) \\ \text{sum0}(x, k) \rightarrow \text{select}(x, k) + \text{sum0}(x, k - 1) \text{ } [k \geq 0] \\ \text{sum0}(x, k) \rightarrow 0 \text{ } [k < 0] \end{array} \right\}$$

Note that this implementation differs from the ones we saw in Example 1.1, because there we were analyzing encodings of imperative programs; on C level there is no functionality for the programmer to explicitly query the length of an array. Here, we use a similar theory signature, but refrain from including error checking.

Note the special role of *values*, which are new in LCTRSs compared to older styles of constrained rewriting. Values are the representatives of the underlying theory. All values are constants (constructor symbols $v()$ which do not take arguments), even if they represent complex structures, as seen in Example 2.3. However, not all constants are values; for instance a constant constructor $\text{error} \in \Sigma_{\text{terms}}$ would not be a value. We will often work with signatures having infinitely many values. Note that we do not match modulo theories, e.g. we do not equate $0 + (x + y)$ with $y + x$ for matching.

Note also the restriction on variables in a constraint being instantiated by values; for instance in Example 2.2, a term $\text{fact}(\text{fact}(3))$ reduces only at the *inner* fact .

Differences to [Kop and Nishida 2013]. In [Kop and Nishida 2013], where LCTRSs are first defined, we assume that $\mathcal{V}$ contains unsorted variables, and use a separate *variable environment* for typing terms. Also, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is there defined as the union of $\rightarrow_{\text{rule}}$ (using rules in $\mathcal{R}$) and $\rightarrow_{\text{calc}}$ (using calculations), whereas here we simply consider calculations as being given by an additional set of calculation rules. These changes give equivalent results, but the current definitions cause a bit less bookkeeping.

A non-equivalent change is the restriction on rules in Σ : in [Kop and Nishida 2013] left-hand sides must have a root symbol in $\Sigma_{\text{terms}} \setminus \Sigma_{\text{theory}}$. We follow Kop [2013] and Kop and Nishida [2014] in weakening this (only asking that they are not logical terms).

Note that, like Kop and Nishida [2013], we refrain from imposing several natural restrictions, such as what Kop and Nishida [2013] call *regularity* (for all $\ell \rightarrow r$ [φ] $\in \mathcal{R}$, $\text{Var}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{Var}(\ell)$) and *standardness* (for all $\ell \rightarrow r$ [φ] $\in \mathcal{R}$, $\ell \in \text{Terms}(\Sigma_{\text{terms}}, \mathcal{V})$). In the case of regularity, this is crucial: the transformation method from Section 3 sometimes creates irregular rules (when given uninitialized variables or user input). Both irregular and non-standard rules may arise during analysis—and *do* in fact arise sometimes in the rewriting induction method we present in Section 4.

2.2. Quantification

The definition of LCTRSs does not permit quantifiers. In, for instance, an LCTRS over integers and arrays, we cannot specify a rule like:

$$\text{extend}(\text{arr}, x) \rightarrow \text{addtoend}(x, \text{arr}) [\forall y \in \{0, \dots, \text{size}(\text{arr}) - 1\} : x \neq \text{select}(\text{arr}, y)]$$

(Where $\text{addtoend} : [\text{int} \times \text{array}(\text{int})] \Rightarrow \text{array}(\text{int}) \in \Sigma_{\text{theory}}$ and $\text{extend} : [\text{array}(\text{int}) \times \text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{array}(\text{int}) \in \Sigma_{\text{terms}}$.)

However, one of the key features of LCTRSs is that theory symbols, including predicates, are not confined to a fixed list. Therefore, we *can* add a new symbol to Σ_{theory} (and $\mathcal{J}$). For the extend rule, we might introduce a symbol $\text{notin} : [\text{int} \times \text{array}(\text{int})] \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ with $\mathcal{J}_{\text{notin}}(u, \langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle) = \top$ iff for all i : $u \neq a_i$, and replace the constraint by $\text{notin}(x, \text{arr})$. This generates exactly the same reduction relation as the original rule.

Thus, we can permit quantifiers in the constraints of rules and also on right-hand sides of rules, as an intuitive notation for fresh predicates. However, as the reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is only decidable if all $\mathcal{J}_f$ are, an *unbounded* quantification would likely not be useful in practice.

Comment: One might argue that adding such new symbols, which have meaning only in a given application, is problematic in practice: no SMT-solver will support the notin symbol, even supposing all common array functions to be implemented. However, for the *theory* this makes no difference. In practical implementations, we might either allow quantifiers as syntactic sugar (and pass the same sugar to the SMT-solver), or add a layer on top of the SMT-solver which translates the new symbol(s), replacing for instance $(\text{notin } u \ a)$ as introduced above by $(\text{forall } ((x \text{ Int})) (\text{distinct } u \ (\text{select } a \ x)))$.

2.3. Rewriting Constrained Terms

In LCTRSs, the objects of study are *terms*, with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ defining the relation between them. However, for analysis it is often useful to consider *constrained terms*: pairs $s[\varphi]$ of a term s and a constraint φ . A constrained term $s[\varphi]$ represents all terms $s\gamma$ where γ respects φ , and can be used to reason about such terms.

Different constrained terms may represent the same terms; for example $f(0)[\text{true}]$ and $f(x)[x = 0]$, or $g(x, y)[x > y]$ and $g(z, u)[u \leq z - 1]$. We consider these terms *equivalent*. Formally, $s[\varphi] \sim t[\psi]$ if for all substitutions γ which respect φ there is a

substitution δ which respects ψ such that $s\gamma = t\delta$, and vice versa. Note that $s[\varphi] \sim s[\psi]$ if and only if $\forall \vec{x} [\exists \vec{y} [\varphi] \leftrightarrow \exists \vec{z} [\psi]]$ holds, where $Var(s) = \{\vec{x}\}$, $Var(\varphi) \setminus Var(s) = \{\vec{y}\}$ and $Var(\psi) \setminus Var(s) = \{\vec{z}\}$.

For a rule $\rho := \ell \rightarrow r[\psi] \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$ and position q , we let $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\rho,q} t[\varphi]$ if $s|_q = \ell\gamma$ and $t = s[r\gamma]_q$ for some substitution γ such that $\gamma(x)$ is a variable in $Var(\varphi)$ or a value for all $x \in LVar(\ell \rightarrow r[\psi])$ and $\varphi \Rightarrow (\psi\gamma)$ is valid. Let $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} t[\varphi]$ if $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\rho,q} t[\varphi]$ for some ρ, q . The relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ on constrained terms is defined as $\sim \cdot \rightarrow_{\text{base}} \cdot \sim$. We say that $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t[\psi]$ at position q by rule ρ if $s[\varphi] \sim \cdot \rightarrow_{\rho,q} \cdot \sim t[\psi]$.

Example 2.4. In the factorial LCTRS from Example 2.2, we have that $\text{fact}(x) [x > 3] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} x * \text{fact}(x-1) [x > 3]$. This constrained term can be further reduced using the calculation rule $x - y \rightarrow z [z = x - y]$, but here we must use the $\sim$ relation, as follows: $x * \text{fact}(x-1) [x > 3] \sim x * \text{fact}(x-1) [x > 3 \wedge z = x-1] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} x * \text{fact}(z) [x > 3 \wedge z = x-1]$. The $\sim$ -relation holds because indeed $\forall x [x > 3 \leftrightarrow \exists z [x > 3 \wedge z = x-1]]$ holds.

Example 2.5. The $\sim$ relation also allows us to reformulate the constraint after a reduction, which is in particular useful if some variables are not used any longer. For example, with the rule $f(x) \rightarrow g(y) [y > x]$, we have: $f(x) [x > 3] \sim f(x) [x > 3 \wedge y > x] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} g(y) [x > 3 \wedge y > x] \sim g(y) [y > 4]$. We do *not* have that $f(x) [\text{true}] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} g(x+1) [\text{true}]$, as $x+1$ cannot be instantiated to a value.

Example 2.6. A constrained term does not always need to be reduced in the most general way. With the rule $f(x) \rightarrow g(y) [y > x]$, we have $f(0) [\text{true}] \sim f(0) [y > 0] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} g(y) [y > 0]$, but we also have $f(0) [\text{true}] \sim f(0) [1 > 0] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} g(1) [1 > 0] \sim g(1) [\text{true}]$.

As intended, constrained reductions give information about usual reductions:

THEOREM 2.7. *If $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t[\psi]$, then for all substitutions γ which respect φ there is a substitution δ which respects ψ such that $s\gamma \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t\delta$. If the former step uses rule ρ at position q , then so does the latter.*

PROOF. We first observe (**): *If $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} t[\psi]$, then $\varphi = \psi$, and for any substitution γ which respects φ also $s\gamma \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t\gamma$.* To see that this holds, note that $\varphi = \psi$ by definition of $\rightarrow_{\text{base}}$. Furthermore, there are some position p , rule $\ell \rightarrow r[c]$, and substitution δ such that $s|_p = \ell\delta$ and $t = s[r\delta]_p$. Writing η for the composition $\gamma \circ \delta$ (so $\eta(x) = \gamma(\delta(x)) = (x\delta)\gamma$ for all variables x), we have on the one hand $(s\gamma)|_p = s|_p\gamma = \ell\delta\gamma = \ell\eta$. On the other hand, $t\gamma = s[r\delta]_p\gamma = (s\gamma)[r\delta\gamma]_p = (s\gamma)[r\eta]_p$. So indeed $s\gamma \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t\gamma$.

Towards proving the theorem, suppose $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t[\varphi]$, so $s[\varphi] \sim s'[\varphi'] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} t'[\psi'] \sim t[\psi]$, and let γ respect φ . By definition of $\sim$, there is some substitution η which respects φ' such that $s\gamma = s'\eta$. By (**) also η respects ψ' and $s'\eta \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t'\eta$. Again by definition of $\sim$, we find δ which respects ψ such that $t'\eta = t\delta$. $\square$

THEOREM 2.8. *If $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t[\psi]$, then for all substitutions δ which respect ψ there is a substitution γ which respects φ such that $s\gamma \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t\delta$. If the former step uses rule ρ at position q , then so does the latter.*

PROOF. Parallel to the proof of Theorem 2.7: if $s[\varphi] \sim s'[\varphi'] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} t'[\psi'] \sim t[\psi]$, then by definition of $\sim$ there are suitable η, γ such that $t\delta = t'\eta \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s'\eta = s\gamma$. $\square$

Comment: It is worth noting that the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ on constrained rewriting terms is *not* stable: in e.g. the system from Example 2.6, we can derive $f(x) [\text{true}] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} g(x) [\text{true}]$ even though $f(0) [\text{true}] \not\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} g(0) [\text{true}]$. This is because the variables in a constrained term are fully changeable; they should be seen as universally or existentially quantified. This is not problematic, as we don't instantiate constrained terms; to reason about constrained reduction we only use Theorems 2.7 and 2.8.

3. TRANSFORMING IMPERATIVE PROGRAMS INTO LCTRSS

Equivalence-preserving transformations of imperative programs into constrained rewriting systems operating on integers have been investigated in e.g. [Falke and Kapur 2009; Falke et al. 2011; Furuichi et al. 2008]; more generally, such translations from imperative to functional programs have been investigated at least since [McCarthy 1960]. Although these papers use different definitions of constrained rewriting, the proposed transformations can be adapted to produce LCTRSs that operate on integers, i.e., use Σ_{theory} as in Example 2.2. What is more, we can extend the ideas to also handle more advanced programming structures, such as arrays and exceptions.

In this section, we will discuss a number of ideas towards a translation from C to LCTRS. A more detailed and formal treatment of the limitation to integers and one-dimensional integer arrays is available online along with an implementation, at:

<http://www.trs.cm.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/c2lctrs/>

Considering the extensiveness of the C-specification, we will not attempt to prove that the result of our transformation exactly (or near-exactly) corresponds to the origin; it would be too hard to define precisely what is meant by such a statement. Instead, we shall rely on an appeal to intuition. An advantage of this approach is that the same ideas and intuition apply to other programming languages as well; it seems likely that a similar translation could be extended to for instance Python or Java in the future.

3.1. Transforming Simple Integer Functions

The base form of the transformation—limited to integer functions with no global variables or function calls—is very similar to the transformations for integer TRSs in [Falke and Kapur 2009; Falke et al. 2011; Furuichi et al. 2008]. Each function is transformed separately. We introduce a function symbol for every statement (including declarations), which operates on the variables in scope. The transition from one statement to another is encoded as a rule, with assignments reflected by argument updates in the right-hand side, and conditions by the constraint. Return statements are encoded by reducing to an expression $\text{return}_f(e)$, where $\text{return}_f : [\text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{result}_f$ is a constructor.

Example 3.1. Consider the following C-function, and its translation:

<pre>int fact(int x) { int z = 1; for (int i = 1; i <= x; i++) z *= i; return z; }</pre>	$\begin{aligned} \text{fact}(x) &\rightarrow u_1(x, 1) \\ u_1(x, z) &\rightarrow u_2(x, z, 1) \\ u_2(x, z, i) &\rightarrow u_3(x, z, i) && [i \leq x] \\ u_2(x, z, i) &\rightarrow u_5(x, z) && [\neg(i \leq x)] \\ u_3(x, z, i) &\rightarrow u_4(x, z * i, i) \\ u_4(x, z, i) &\rightarrow u_2(x, z, i + 1) \\ u_5(x, z) &\rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{fact}}(z) \end{aligned}$
---	--

For Σ_{theory} we assume the standard integer signature; Σ_{terms} contains fact , all u_i and the constructor return_f , all of which have output sort result_f and arguments sorts int .

Of course, a realistic translation of C-code must also deal with the absence of a boolean datatype, functions omitting a return statement, operator precedence and expressions with side effects (think for instance of using $--x$ as a loop condition). All this can be done,⁴ but we will not go into detail here.

Finally, the generated system is optimized to make it more amenable to analysis.⁵

⁴This is discussed in the formal treatment at <http://www.trs.cm.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/c2lctrs/formal.pdf>

⁵Variations of such preprocessing steps preserving the properties of interest to simplify the output of an automatic translation are fairly standard in program analysis, see e.g. [Albert et al. 2008; Alpuente et al. 2007; Beyer et al. 2009; Falke et al. 2011; Spoto et al. 2009].

- *Combining rules.* Similar to [Falke et al. 2011], we repeat the following process:
 - select any unconstrained rule ρ of the form $u(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow r$ where u is not the initial symbol of a C-function (like `fact` in Example 3.1), and u neither occurs in r nor in the left-hand side of any other rule; the repetition stops if no such ρ exists;
 - rewrite all right-hand sides with ρ ;
 - remove both the rule ρ and the symbol u .
 This process does not substantially alter the multi-step reduction relation $\rightarrow^*$ as the only symbols removed are those which we think of as “intermediate” symbols. On completion of this process, if there are distinct rules $\ell \rightarrow r [\varphi]$ and $\ell \rightarrow r [\psi]$ (modulo renaming), these are combined into $\ell \rightarrow r [\varphi \vee \psi]$. We may also choose to combine constrained rules, with some limitations: given rules $\ell \rightarrow u(\vec{r'}) [\varphi]$ and $u(\vec{x}_i) \rightarrow r_i [\psi_i]$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we may replace them by $\ell \rightarrow r_i[\vec{x}_i := \vec{r'}] [\varphi \wedge \psi_i[\vec{x}_i := \vec{r'}]]$, provided:
 - u is not the initial symbol of a function, and does not occur in ℓ or in any other rule except as root symbol (otherwise the rule removal would not be correct);
 - the r_j do not contain defined symbols (as then we might inadvertently remove a non-terminating subterm, which *would* impact the multi-step reduction relation).
- *Removing unused arguments.* For all function symbols, and all their argument positions, we mark whether the position is “used”:
 - all argument(s) of every return_f and initial symbols (e.g. `fact`) are used;
 - for other symbols u_i of arity n and every $1 \leq j \leq n$: if there is a rule $u_i(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n) \rightarrow r [\varphi]$ where ℓ_j is not a variable⁶ or occurs in φ , then argument j is used in u_i ;
 - for all rules $u_i(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n) \rightarrow r [\varphi]$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$: argument j is used in u_i if ℓ_j is a variable occurring at a *used position* in r ; here, a position p is used in s if either $p = \epsilon$ or $p = i \cdot p'$, $s = f(\vec{t})$, argument i is used in f and position p' is used in t_i .
 Note that the last step is recursive, essentially calculating a fixpoint; in summary, an argument position is *used* if it is possible to reduce to a term where we actually need the subterm at that position as part of a constraint or the function’s return value. When a variable is not used in any later statement, we will avoid carrying it along.
- *Simplifying constraints.* Constraints may be brought into an equivalent form, for instance by removing duplicate clauses or replacing clauses like $\neg(x > y)$ by $x \leq y$.

We will use these optimizations also for the extended transformations of Sections 3.2–3.6. Correctness relies on the fact that the LCTRSs created using this transformation (and its extensions) are “well-behaved”; most importantly, all rules are left-linear (i.e. no left-hand side of a rule contains multiple occurrences of the same variable).

Example 3.2. Let us first consider the simplification of a toy function, which demonstrates the importance of removing unused arguments.

<pre> int f(int x) { int y, z; if (x < 0) return 0; z = 0; while (x > 0) { x--; z += x; } y = z + x; return y; } </pre>	$ \begin{array}{ll} f(x) \rightarrow u_1(x, y, z) & \\ u_1(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_2(x, y, z) & [x < 0] \\ u_1(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_3(x, y, z) & [\neg(x < 0)] \\ u_2(x, y, z) \rightarrow \text{return}_f(0) & \\ u_3(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_4(x, y, 0) & \\ u_4(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_5(x, y, z) & [x > 0] \\ u_4(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_7(x, y, z) & [\neg(x > 0)] \\ u_5(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_6(x - 1, y, z) & \\ u_6(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_4(x, y, z + x) & \\ u_7(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_8(x, z + x, z) & \\ u_8(x, y, z) \rightarrow \text{return}_f(y) & \end{array} $
---	--

Note that the initial rule $f(x) \rightarrow u_1(x, y, z)$ has variables in the right-hand side which

⁶This cannot happen with the simple functions of this section, but will become relevant in Section 3.5.

do not occur on the left. Recall that free variables must be instantiated by values but are otherwise not restricted, so this allows an arbitrary integer to be assigned—which corresponds to the C-specification for uninitialized variables. In the simplified version, this does not occur. To see this, consider the remainder after combining rules:

$$\begin{array}{ll} f(x) \rightarrow \text{return}_f(0) & [x < 0] \\ f(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_4(x, y, 0) & [\neg(x < 0)] \\ u_4(x, y, z) \rightarrow u_4(x-1, y, z+x-1) & [x > 0] \\ u_4(x, y, z) \rightarrow \text{return}_f(z+x) & [\neg(x > 0)] \end{array}$$

Now, the first and third arguments of u_4 are used (in the constraint and return value), but the second is not: it is merely passed along in the recursive call. Removing this variable and simplifying the constraints, we obtain:

$$\begin{array}{ll} f(x) \rightarrow \text{return}_f(0) & [x < 0] \\ f(x) \rightarrow u_4(x, 0) & [x \geq 0] \\ u_4(x, z) \rightarrow u_4(x-1, z+x-1) & [x > 0] \\ u_4(x, z) \rightarrow \text{return}_f(z+x) & [x \leq 0] \end{array}$$

This system is *orthogonal* in the sense of [Kop and Nishida 2013], so easily seen to be *confluent*, which is beneficial for analysis. The original LCTRS was also confluent, but this was harder to see.

Comment: When considering *complexity*—for instance defined as the number of certain calculation steps—the argument removal step is dangerous, as it may remove calculations. In such cases we would use a different simplification method.

Example 3.3. Optimizing the LCTRS from Example 3.1, we obtain:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{fact}(x) \rightarrow u_2(x, 1, 1) & \\ u_2(x, z, i) \rightarrow u_2(x, z * i, i + 1) & [i \leq x] \\ u_2(x, z, i) \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{fact}}(z) & [i > x] \end{array}$$

Differences to older work. In contrast to existing transformations to integer TRSs (e.g. [Falke and Kapur 2009; Falke et al. 2011; Furuichi et al. 2008]), we do not consider *basic blocks*, but simply create rules for every statement; this gives no substantial difference after the simplification step. Additionally, the return_f symbol is new in this work: in [Falke and Kapur 2009; Falke et al. 2011] the corresponding statement was simply omitted (as its focus was on *termination*), while in [Furuichi et al. 2008] the final term reduces directly to the return-value, e.g. $u_4(x, z) \rightarrow z + x [x \leq 0]$.

3.2. Non-Integer Data Types

In the transformation from Section 3.1 there is nothing special about integers. As the definition of LCTRSs permits values and calculation symbols from arbitrary domains, the translation is not changed by allowing for instance variables declared as floating points. We might interpret the double data type as either real numbers or as double-precision floating point numbers—this choice is left to the user, and may vary depending on applications. The only requirement is that a suitable theory signature—with corresponding SMT-solver if the system is to be analyzed automatically—is available.

An important thing to keep in mind is that LCTRSs do not support implicit type casting. In an expression $x + y$ where x is declared as `int` and y as `double`, we have to explicitly cast x to `double`, and use a separate symbol such as $+$ for double addition.

Example 3.4. Consider the following C-function and its translation.

```
double halfsum(double thold) {
  double ret = 0.0;
  for (int d = 2; d < 1000000; d *= 2) {
    ret += 1.0 / d;
    if (ret > thold) return ret;
  }
}
```

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{halfsum}(t) & \rightarrow u_2(t, 0.0, 2) \\
u_2(t, r, d) & \rightarrow u_4(t, r +. 1.0/\text{todouble}(d), d) \quad [d < 1000000.0] \\
u_2(t, r, d) & \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{halfsum}}(rnd) \quad [d \geq 1000000.0] \\
u_4(t, r, d) & \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{halfsum}}(r) \quad [r >. t] \\
u_4(t, r, d) & \rightarrow u_2(t, r, d * 2) \quad [r \leq. t]
\end{array}$$

This both demonstrates an explicit cast, and the way we handle an undefined return value (by a fresh variable, which may be instantiated with a random value).

3.3. Error Handling

Of course, the transformation of Section 3.1 does not fully reflect the original C-program: as computers have limited memory, most programming languages do not support integers as primitive data types, but rather work with *bitvectors*.

There are various ways to deal with this issue. First, we could change the theory. Rather than including all integers as values, we let $\text{Val}_{\text{int}} = \{\text{MININT}, \dots, \text{MAXINT}\}$, and alter $\mathcal{J}$ to make $\mathcal{J}_+$, $\mathcal{J}_-$ and $\mathcal{J}_*$ wrap around (e.g. $\mathcal{J}_-(\text{MININT}, 1) = \text{MAXINT}$). The LCTRS we thus create has the same rules, but acts more closely to the real program behavior.

However, wrapping might not be what we want: in practice, integer overflow is often indicative of an *error*. Indeed, in the programming language C, an overflow for the type `int` leads to undefined behavior (which also surfaces in optimizing compilers such as gcc or clang). In order to model this, we will reduce to a special error state.

Thus, for every rule $u_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow r \ [\varphi]$: if this rule represents a transition where an error may occur under condition τ , then we split it in two:

$$u_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow r \ [\varphi \wedge \neg\tau] \quad u_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow \text{error}_f \ [\varphi \wedge \tau]$$

As usual, we simplify the resulting constraint (writing e.g. $x < 0$ instead of $\neg(x \geq 0)$).

Example 3.5. Continuing Example 3.3, we generate the following rewrite rules:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{fact}(x) & \rightarrow u_2(x, 1, 1) \\
u_2(x, z, i) & \rightarrow u_2(x, z * i, i + 1) \quad [i \leq x \wedge z * i \leq \text{MAXINT} \wedge z * i \geq \text{MININT} \wedge i + 1 \leq \text{MAXINT}] \\
u_2(x, z, i) & \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{fact}} \quad [i \leq x \wedge (z * i > \text{MAXINT} \vee z * i < \text{MININT} \vee i + 1 > \text{MAXINT})] \\
u_2(x, z, i) & \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{fact}}(z) \quad [i > x]
\end{array}$$

Note that we could easily model assertions and `throw` statements for exceptions in the same way. Similarly, we can handle division by zero: whenever $s \text{ div } t$ or $s \text{ mod } t$ is used in a rule, we add $t \neq 0$ to its constraint and add a new rule to reduce to error if $t = 0$.

We can choose whether to add error transitions before or after the simplification step. The distinction is important: when simplifying, calculations which do not contribute to the final result are thrown away. In the case of overflow errors, it may seem reasonable to consider the post-simplification rules, as we did in Example 3.5. In the case of for instance division by zero, we should add the errors to the pre-simplification rules.

Comment: When transforming a function into an LCTRS, we can *choose* what errors to model. For instance, we could ignore overflows (effectively assuming unbounded integers), but still test for division by zero. We could also let error_f be a constructor which takes an argument, i.e. $\text{error}_f : [\text{Errors}] \Rightarrow \text{result}_f \in \Sigma_{\text{terms}}$, where `Errors` is a sort with constructors `IntegerOverflow`, `DivisionByZero` and so on.

3.4. Global Variables

Thus far, we have considered very *local* code: a function never calls other functions or modifies global variables. By altering the return constructors, the latter is easily changed: we assume that a function symbol is given all global variables that it uses as input, and returns those global variables it alters as output, along with its return value. This change also allows for non-redundant `void` functions.

Example 3.6. Consider the following short program and its (simplified) translation:

```
int best;
int up(int x) {
  if (x > best) { best = x; return 1; }
  return 0;
}
```

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{up}(b, x) \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{up}}(x, 1) & [x > b] \\ \text{up}(b, x) \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{up}}(b, 0) & [x \leq b] \end{array}$$

3.5. Function Calls

Next, let us consider *function calls*. A difficulty is that they may occur in an expression, e.g. $\text{fact}(3) + 5$. This expression is not well-sorted in the corresponding LCTRS: $\text{fact}(3)$ has sort $\text{result}_{\text{fact}}$, not int . To avoid this issue, and to propagate errors, we do two things.

First, expressions involving function calls which are not of the form $\text{var} = \text{func}(\text{arg}_1, \dots, \text{arg}_n)$ are split up: the return value of each function call is assigned to a temporary variable before using. For example:

```
int ncr(int x, int y) {
  int a = fact(x);
  int b = fact(y) * fact(x - y);
  return a / b;
}
```

$$\Rightarrow$$

```
int ncr(int x, int y) {
  int a = fact(x);
  int tmp1 = fact(y);
  int tmp2 = fact(x - y);
  int b = tmp1 * tmp2;
  return a / b;
}
```

This change may cause declarations at places in the function where a C-compiler would not accept them, but for the translation, this is no issue. We translate the resulting function, by executing function calls in a separate parameter and using a separate step to examine the outcome of a function call and assign it to the relevant variable(s).

Example 3.7. Again, the idea is best demonstrated by an example. Suppose we have the program from Example 3.6, along with the following function.

```
void nag() {
  for (int i = 0; i < 10; i++) {
    int k;
    output("Please type an integer: ");
    k = input();
    up(k);
  }
}
```

Here, we assume functions `output` and `input` to be pre-defined IO-functions. Note that we do not need to change this program, because the return value of `up(k)` is not used in a complex expression. Considering user input as a random number, and ignoring the observation that no errors can occur in `up`, we initially obtain the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{nag}(b) \rightarrow v_1(b, 0) & \\ v_1(b, i) \rightarrow v_2(b, i, \text{rnd}) & [i < 10] \\ v_1(b, i) \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{nag}}(b) & [\neg(i < 10)] \\ v_2(b, i, k) \rightarrow v_3(b, i, \text{rnd}) & \\ v_3(b, i, k) \rightarrow v_4(b, i, k, \text{up}(k)) & \\ v_4(b, i, \text{error}_{\text{up}}) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{nag}} & \\ v_4(b, i, \text{return}_{\text{up}}(b', j)) \rightarrow v_1(b', i + 1) & \end{array}$$

Note the way the rule for v_2 uses a fresh variable in the right-hand side to create an arbitrary integer, which simulates user input. After simplifying, we obtain:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{nag}(b) \rightarrow v_1(b, 0) & \\ v_1(b, i) \rightarrow v_2(b, i, \text{up}(\text{rnd})) & [i < 10] \\ v_1(b, i) \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{nag}}(b) & [i \geq 10] \\ v_2(b, i, \text{error}_{\text{up}}) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{nag}} & \\ v_2(b, i, \text{return}_{\text{up}}(b', j)) \rightarrow v_1(b', i + 1) & \end{array}$$

Example 3.8. The ncr program given above is transformed to the following simplified LCTRS (where we test for division by zero but not integer overflow for simplicity):

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{ncr}(x, y) \rightarrow u_2(x, y, \text{fact}(x)) & u_2(x, y, \text{error}_{\text{fact}}) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{ncr}} \\
 u_2(x, y, \text{return}_{\text{fact}}(k)) \rightarrow u_3(x, y, k, \text{fact}(y)) & u_3(x, y, a, \text{error}_{\text{fact}}) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{ncr}} \\
 u_3(x, y, a, \text{return}_{\text{fact}}(k)) \rightarrow u_4(x, y, a, k, \text{fact}(x - y)) & u_4(x, y, a, t_1, \text{error}_{\text{fact}}) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{ncr}} \\
 u_4(x, y, a, t_1, \text{return}_{\text{fact}}(k)) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{ncr}} & [t_1 * k = 0] \\
 u_4(x, y, a, t_1, \text{return}_{\text{fact}}(k)) \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{ncr}}(a \text{ div } (t_1 * k)) & [t_1 * k \neq 0]
 \end{array}$$

3.6. Handling Arrays

Finally, let us consider arrays. We have already hinted at the approach in Example 1.1, and now that we have seen how to handle side effects in the form of global variables, there should be little novelty involved. For now, we will not consider aliasing.

To start, we must fix a theory signature and corresponding interpretations.

For any given theory sort ι which admits at least one value, say 0_ι , we introduce a new sort $\text{array}(\iota)$, which is mapped to finite-length sequences of $\mathcal{I}_\iota$; that is, $\mathcal{I}_{\text{array}(\iota)} = \mathcal{I}_\iota^*$. Additionally, in the theory of arrays over ι , we introduce the following theory symbols (in addition to $\Sigma_{\text{theory}}^{\text{int}}$ and whichever other theories we decide to support):

- $\text{size}_\iota : [\text{array}(\iota)] \Rightarrow \text{int}$: we define $\mathcal{J}_{\text{size}_\iota}(a)$ as the length of the sequence a .
- $\text{select}_\iota : [\text{array}(\iota) \times \text{int}] \Rightarrow \iota$: if $a = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle$, we define $\mathcal{J}_{\text{select}_\iota}(a, k) = a_k$ if $0 \leq k < n$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\text{select}_\iota}(a, k) = 0_\iota$ otherwise.
- $\text{store}_\iota : [\text{array}(\iota) \times \text{int} \times \iota] \Rightarrow \text{array}(\iota)$: if $a = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle$, we define $\mathcal{J}_{\text{store}_\iota}(a, k, v) = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}, v, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle$ if $0 \leq k < n$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\text{store}_\iota}(a, k, v) = a$ otherwise.

We will usually omit the subscript ι when the sort is clear from context.

Note that this notion of arrays is different from the one in SMT-LIB⁷, where arrays are functions from one domain to another (the domain does not need to be finite, and is often taken to consist of all integers or bitvectors). For program analysis, the alternative use of finite-length sequences seems practical and more realistic.⁸

To implement array *lookups* $a[i]$ in an LCTRS, we simply use $\text{select}(a, i)$; to guarantee correctness of this test, we add bound checks to the constraint, and reduce to error_f if such a check is not satisfied. To implement array *assignments* $a[i] = e$ in an LCTRS, we replace a by $\text{store}(a, i, e)$; here, too, we add bound checks and possible error reduction. In addition, since the underlying memory of the array was altered, the updated variable must be included in the return value.

Example 3.9. Consider the following C-implementation of the `strcpy` function, which copies the contents of `original` into the array `goal`, until a 0 is reached.

```

void strcpy(char goal[], char original[]) {
    int i = 0;
    for (; original[i] != 0; i++) goal[i] = original[i];
    goal[i] = 0;
}

```

For simplicity, we think of strings simply as integer arrays (although alternative choices for $\mathcal{I}_{\text{char}}$ make little difference). The function does not update `original` at any point, but does potentially update `goal`, so the return value must include the latter,

⁷<http://www.smt-lib.org/>

⁸As for implementation, it is not hard to translate an SMT-problem on this array signature to a problem concerning traditional SMT-LIB arrays.

but not the former. We find the following implementation as an LCTRS:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{strcpy}(x, y) &\rightarrow v(x, y, 0) \\
v(x, y, i) &\rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}} [i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(y)] \\
v(x, y, i) &\rightarrow w(x, y, i) [0 \leq i < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(y, i) = 0] \\
v(x, y, i) &\rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}} [0 \leq i < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(y, i) \neq 0 \wedge i \geq \text{size}(x)] \\
v(x, y, i) &\rightarrow v(\text{store}(x, i, \text{select}(y, i)), y, i + 1) \\
&\quad [0 \leq i < \text{size}(x) \wedge i < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(y, i) \neq 0] \\
w(x, y, i) &\rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}} [i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(x)] \\
w(x, y, i) &\rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{strcpy}}(\text{store}(x, i, 0)) [0 \leq i < \text{size}(x)]
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this LCTRS can be further simplified by for instance combining the third rules with the last two rules, but we have refrained from doing so for clarity.

Comment: It should now be clear how the systems from Section 1.1 have been translated from C-code to LCTRSs. The only deviation is that there, we have included the array *arr* in the return value of *sum1*, *sum2*, and *sum4*, which is not necessary as it is not modified in these cases. This was done to allow a direct comparison with *sum3*, where the array *is* modified. In addition, the return and error symbols in these examples are not indexed, for the same reason.

Aliasing. The transformation described here allows us to abstract from the underlying memory model when encoding arrays. This straightforward interpretation as sequences of values makes analysis easier, but has the downside that it does not allow for aliasing or pointer arithmetic beyond what is needed to operate inside an array. Aside from explicit aliasing, this also means that for instance properties we prove about *strcpy* from Example 3.9 might fail to hold for a call like *strcpy(a, a)*.

As we only seek to handle *part* of the language, this does not need to be an issue; in practice, many programs are written without explicit pointer use, and when aliasing occurs, it can often be automatically removed. For example, we might replace *strcpy(a, a)* by *strcpy'(a)*, and create new rules for *strcpy'* by collapsing the variables in the rules for *strcpy*. To handle programs with more sophisticated pointer use, we can encode the memory as a list of arrays, and pass this along as a variable. This is somewhat beyond the scope of this paper, but is explored in Appendix A.

3.7. Remarks

Of course, the treatment in this section was not formal, and moreover incomplete; we are handling only a fraction of the C-language, albeit an important fraction for verification. We believe it can easily be extended further, with for instance the *switch* statement, user-defined data structures or standard library functions. Important to note is that there are several choices to be made regarding a translation. Most pertinently, we saw the choices what sort of interpretations to use (e.g. whether *int* should be mapped to the set of integers or bitvectors) and what errors to consider.

In this paper, and in line with our automatic translation at <http://www.trs.cm.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/c2lctrs/>, we have chosen to work with real integers, and not test for overflows. We also do not permit aliasing. By avoiding the more sophisticated translation steps, we obtain LCTRSs which are correspondingly easier to analyze.

The LCTRSs created using this transformation are well-behaved: all rules are left-linear, non-overlapping, and complete in the sense that all ground terms which are not constructor terms can be reduced. It is possible for rules to have variables in the right-hand side and constraint which do not occur on the left, but this is mostly due to unspecified values in the original code. Where such variables do not occur—or are removed in the simplification step—the resulting LCTRSs are confluent.

4. REWRITING INDUCTION FOR LCTRSS

In this section, we adapt the inference rules from [Reddy 1990; Falke and Kapur 2012; Sakata et al. 2009] to inductive theorem proving with LCTRSs. This provides the core theory to use rewriting induction, which will be strengthened with a lemma generalization technique in Section 5.

We start by listing some restrictions we need to impose on LCTRSs for the method to work (Section 4.1). Then, we provide the theory for the technique (Section 4.2), and prove its correctness (Section 4.3). Compared to [Reddy 1990; Falke and Kapur 2012; Sakata et al. 2009], we make several changes to optimally handle the new formalism. We complete with three illustrative examples (Sections 4.4 and 4.5).

4.1. Restrictions

In order for rewriting induction to be successful, we need to impose certain restrictions. We limit interest to LCTRSs which satisfy the following properties:

- (1) all core theory symbols ($\wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow, \neg$ and each $=_\iota, \neq_\iota$) are present in Σ_{theory} ;
- (2) the LCTRS is terminating, so there is no infinite reduction $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s_2 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \dots$;
- (3) the system is *quasi-reductive*, i.e., for every ground term s either $s \in \text{Terms}(\mathcal{C}_{ons}, \emptyset)$ (we say s is a *ground constructor term*), or there is some t such that $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t$;⁹
- (4) there are ground terms of every sort occurring in Σ .

Property 1 is the standard assumption we saw in Section 2. We will need these symbols, for instance, to add new information to a constraint. Termination (property 2) is crucial in the inductive derivation, as the method uses induction on an extension of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ on terms. Property 3 which, together with termination, provides *sufficient completeness*, makes it possible to do an exhaustive case analysis on the rules applicable to an equation. It also allows us to assume that variables are always instantiated by ground constructor terms.

The last property is natural, since inductive theorem proving makes a statement about *ground* terms. Function symbols which cannot be assigned ground arguments can simply be omitted. Note that, together with quasi-reductivity and termination, this implies that there are ground *constructor* terms of all sorts.

Methods to prove both quasi-reductivity and termination have previously been published for different styles of constrained rewriting; see e.g. [Falke and Kapur 2012] for quasi-reductivity and [Falke 2009; Sakata et al. 2011] for termination. These methods are easily adapted to LCTRSs. Quasi-reductivity is handled in Appendix B, and is moreover always satisfied by systems obtained from the transformations in Section 3. Some basics of termination analysis for LCTRSs are discussed in [Kop 2013].

4.2. Rewriting Induction

We now introduce the notions of *constrained equations* and *inductive theorems*.

Definition 4.1. A (*constrained*) *equation* is a triple $s \approx t [\varphi]$ with s and t terms and φ a constraint. We write $s \simeq t [\varphi]$ to denote either $s \approx t [\varphi]$ or $t \approx s [\varphi]$. A substitution γ *respects* $s \approx t [\varphi]$ if γ respects φ and $\text{Var}(s) \cup \text{Var}(t) \subseteq \text{Dom}(\gamma)$; it is called a *ground constructor substitution* if all $\gamma(x)$ with $x \in \text{Dom}(\gamma)$ are ground constructor terms.

An equation $s \approx t [\varphi]$ is an *inductive theorem* of an LCTRS $\mathcal{R}$ if $s\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t\gamma$ for any ground constructor substitution γ that respects this equation.

⁹A more standard definition of this property would be that for every defined or calculation symbol f and suitable ground constructor terms $s_1, \dots, s_n$ the term $f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ reduces. As observed in Appendix B, this definition is equivalent.

Intuitively, if an equation $f(\vec{x}) \approx g(\vec{x}) [\varphi]$ is an inductive theorem, then f and g define the same function (conditional on φ , and assuming confluence).

To prove that an equation is an inductive theorem, we consider nine inference rules. Four of them originate in [Reddy 1990]; three are based on extensions [Bouhoula 1997; Falke and Kapur 2012; Sakata et al. 2009]. The last two, GENERALIZATION and COMPLETENESS, are new; the former offers a shortcut for lemma equations, while the latter is used to strengthen the disproving methodology. All these rules modify a triple $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, b)$, called a *proof state*. Here, $\mathcal{E}$ is a set of equations, $\mathcal{H}$ a set of constrained rewrite rules with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}$ terminating, and $b \in \{\text{COMPLETE}, \text{INCOMPLETE}\}$. A rule in $\mathcal{H}$ plays the role of an *induction hypothesis* for “proving” the equations in $\mathcal{E}$, and is called an *induction rule*. The flag b indicates whether we can use the current proof state to *refute* that the initial equation is an inductive theorem; we can do so if $b = \text{COMPLETE}$.

The three *core* inference rules from [Reddy 1990] are adapted to LCTRSs as follows.

SIMPLIFICATION. If $s \approx t [\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} u \approx t [\psi]$, where $\approx$ is seen as a fresh constructor for the purpose of constrained term reduction,¹⁰ then we may derive:

$$(\mathcal{E} \uplus \{(s \approx t [\varphi])\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E} \cup \{(u \approx t [\psi])\}, \mathcal{H}, b)$$

DELETION. If $s = t$ or φ is not satisfiable, we can delete $s \approx t [\varphi]$ from $\mathcal{E}$:

$$(\mathcal{E} \uplus \{s \approx t [\varphi]\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, b)$$

EXPANSION. Let $\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)$ be a set containing, for all rules $\ell \rightarrow r[\psi] \in \mathcal{R}^{11}$ such that ℓ is unifiable with $s|_p$ with most general unifier γ and $\varphi\gamma \wedge \psi\gamma$ is (or may be)¹² satisfiable, an equation $s' \approx t' [\varphi']$ where $s[\ell]_p\gamma \approx t\gamma [(\varphi\gamma) \wedge (\psi\gamma)] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s' \approx t' [\varphi']$ with rule $\ell \rightarrow r[\psi]$ at position $1 \cdot p$. Here, as in SIMPLIFICATION, $\approx$ is seen as a fresh constructor for the reduction. Intuitively, Expd generates all resulting equations if a ground constructor instance of $s \approx t [\varphi]$ is reduced at position p of s . If p is a position of s such that $s|_p$ is *basic* (i.e., $s|_p = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ with f a defined symbol and all s_i constructor terms), we may derive:

$$(\mathcal{E} \uplus \{s \approx t [\varphi]\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E} \cup \text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p), \mathcal{H}, b)$$

If, moreover, $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H} \cup \{s \rightarrow t [\varphi]\}$ is terminating, we may even derive:

$$(\mathcal{E} \uplus \{s \approx t [\varphi]\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E} \cup \text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p), \mathcal{H} \cup \{s \rightarrow t [\varphi]\}, b)$$

Note that, if $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is non-deterministic (which may happen when considering irregular rules), we can choose how to build Expd .

These inference rules differ from [Reddy 1990] in several ways. Partially, this is because we consider LCTRSs rather than plain TRSs, and have to handle the constraints: hence we use constrained reduction rather than normal reduction in SIMPLIFICATION, and include an unsatisfiability case in DELETION.

In EXPANSION, we have made more structural changes; our definition also differs from the corresponding rules in [Falke and Kapur 2012; Sakata et al. 2009], where the method is defined for different styles of constrained rewriting.

¹⁰It does not suffice if $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} u[\psi]$; when reducing constrained terms, unused variables may be manipulated at will, which causes problems if they are used in t . For example,

$$f(x+0)[x > y] \sim f(x+0)[z = x+0] \rightarrow_{\text{base}} f(z)[z = x+0] \sim f(x)[y < x]$$

but we should certainly not replace an equation $f(x+0) \approx g(y)[x > y]$ by $f(x) \approx g(y)[x < y]$.

¹¹Here, we assume that the variables in the rules are renamed to be distinct from the ones in s, t, φ .

¹²Although we do not *have* to include equations in $\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)$ which correspond to rules that give an unsatisfiable constraint, it is sometimes convenient to postpone the satisfiability check; if this creates additional equations with unsatisfiable constraints, they can afterwards be removed with DELETION.

To start, we use constrained reduction, whereas the authors of [Reddy 1990; Falke and Kapur 2012; Sakata et al. 2009] use direct instantiation (e.g. $\text{Expd}(s, t, p)$ contains elements of the form $s[r\gamma]_p \approx t$). This was done to better handle irregular rules, especially those where the right-hand side introduces fresh variables, i.e. $\ell \rightarrow r[\varphi]$ where $\text{Var}(r) \cap \text{Var}(\varphi) \not\subseteq \text{Var}(\ell)$. Such rules occur for example in transformed iterative functions where variables are declared but not immediately initialized. The alternative formulation of $\mathcal{R}$ in Section 5, which is essential for our lemma generalization technique, also uses such irregular rules.

Second, we included a case where no rule is added. This is needed to allow progress in cases when adding the rule might cause loss of termination. Forms of this case appear as a separate rule in other work, e.g. CASE ANALYSIS in [Bouhoula 1997] and REWRITE/PARTIAL SPLITTING in [Bouhoula and Jacquemard 2008b; Bouhoula and Jacquemard 2008a]. A weaker form involving constraints is given in [Falke and Kapur 2012] (CASE-SIMPLIFY).

The next two inference rules are adapted from [Sakata et al. 2009] and [Falke and Kapur 2012]. They provide a link between the equation part $s \approx t$ and the constraint.

EQ-DELETION. If all $s_i, t_i \in \text{Terms}(\Sigma_{\text{theory}}, \text{Var}(\varphi))$, then we can derive:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{E} \uplus \{C[s_1, \dots, s_n] \simeq C[t_1, \dots, t_n][\varphi]\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \\ & (\mathcal{E} \cup \{C[s_1, \dots, s_n] \approx C[t_1, \dots, t_n][\varphi \wedge \neg(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n s_i = t_i)]\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \end{aligned}$$

$C[\]$ is allowed to contain symbols in Σ_{theory} . Intuitively, if $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n s_i = t_i$ holds, then $C[s_1, \dots, s_n]\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}}^* C[t_1, \dots, t_n]\gamma$ and thus, we are done. We exclude this case from the equation by adding $\neg(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n s_i = t_i)$ to the constraint. This inference rule originates in [Sakata et al. 2009] and can, in combination with DELETION, be seen as a generalized variant of THEORY $_{\top}$ in [Falke and Kapur 2012].

DISPROVE. If $\vdash s : \iota$ and one of the following holds:

- $s, t \in \text{Terms}(\Sigma_{\text{theory}}, \mathcal{V})$, ι is a theory sort,¹³ and $\varphi \wedge s \neq t$ is satisfiable;
- $s = f(\vec{s})$ and $t = g(\vec{t})$ with f, g distinct constructors;
- s is a variable not in $\text{Var}(\varphi)$, φ is satisfiable, there are at least two different constructors with output sort ι and either t is a variable distinct from s , or t has the form $g(\vec{t})$ with g a constructor.

Then we may derive:

$$(\mathcal{E} \uplus s \simeq t[\varphi], \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \perp$$

The first case of this rule corresponds to THEORY $_{\top}$ in [Falke and Kapur 2012] and Theorem 7.2 in [Sakata et al. 2009]; the second to POSITIVE CLASH in [Bouhoula 1997]. The third case is new in rewriting induction, although it appears in [Huet and Hullot 1982], an implicit induction method based on completion.

Where [Falke and Kapur 2012] and [Sakata et al. 2009] focus on systems which only have theory symbols and defined symbols (so where most of the reasoning can be moved to the constraint), in the LCTRS setting we are also interested in non-theory constructors, such as error_f and return_f . In order to support reasoning about systems where such constructors are admitted, we add one further rule:

CONSTRUCTOR. If f is a constructor, we can derive:

$$(\mathcal{E} \uplus \{f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \approx f(t_1, \dots, t_n)[\varphi]\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E} \cup \{s_i \approx t_i[\varphi] \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}, \mathcal{H}, b)$$

¹³Note that this (only) excludes the case where s and t are both non-logical variables.

The CONSTRUCTOR rule originates in [Bouhoula 1997], where it is called POSITIVE DECOMPOSITION, although variations occur in earlier work on implicit induction, e.g., [Huet and Hullot 1982]. It is used to split up a large equation into smaller problems.

Sometimes it is useful to make the problem seemingly harder. To this end, we consider the last inference rule from [Reddy 1990] and a closely related new rule.

POSTULATE. For any set of equations $\mathcal{E}'$, we can derive:

$$(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}, \text{INCOMPLETE})$$

GENERALIZATION. If for all substitutions γ which respect φ there is a substitution δ which respects ψ with $s\gamma = s'\delta$ and $t\gamma = t'\delta$, then we can derive:

$$(\mathcal{E} \uplus \{s \approx t [\varphi]\}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E} \cup \{s' \approx t' [\psi]\}, \mathcal{H}, \text{INCOMPLETE})$$

The POSTULATE rule allows us to add additional equations to $\mathcal{E}$ (although at a price: we cannot conclude non-equivalence after adding a potentially unsound equation). The reason to do so is that in proving the equations in $\mathcal{E}'$ to be inductive theorems, we may derive new induction rules. These can then be used to simplify the elements of $\mathcal{E}$.

GENERALIZATION serves a similar purpose: a more general equation may be easier to handle inductively. This inference rule is not *necessary*: we could also add $s' \approx t' [\psi]$ using POSTULATE, and use the resulting induction rules to eliminate $s \approx t [\varphi]$ as well. By generalizing instead, we avoid extra steps, which is useful because we use a generalization method in this paper. Without constraints, GENERALIZATION can be seen as a combination of POSTULATE and the SUBSUMPTION rule in [Bouhoula 1997], which may be why it has not been formalized for (constrained or unconstrained) rewriting induction before. There are, however, several results for generalizing equations in the literature [Bundy et al. 1993; Bundy et al. 2005; Basin and Walsh 1992; Walsh 1996; Urso and Kounalis 2004], making the formalization useful beyond just this paper.

Although to those not familiar with rewriting induction, the need to choose arbitrary new equations for use in POSTULATE or even to choose suitable generalized equations for GENERALIZATION may seem somewhat problematic, this is actually a key step. Complex theorems typically require more than straight induction, both in the current setting and in mathematical proofs in general. Therefore, the generation of suitable *lemma equations* $\mathcal{E}'$ is not only part, but even at the heart, of inductive theorem proving. Consequently, this subject has been extensively investigated [Bundy et al. 2005; Kapur and Sakhanenko 2003; Kapur and Subramaniam 1996; Nakabayashi et al. 2010; Urso and Kounalis 2004; Walsh 1996], and a large variety of lemma generation techniques exist. Our *generalization* method introduces a specific kind of lemma equation, which can be seen as weakening the assumptions of an induction hypothesis.

The downside of both POSTULATE and GENERALIZATION is the possible loss of the completeness flag: if ever a new or generalized equation is introduced, we can no longer conclude that we did not start with a set of inductive theorems. To weaken this problem—and thus increase the potential of automatic tools which might wish to combine the search for a proof and a disproof—we add our final inference rule.

COMPLETENESS. For any set of equations $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{E}$ we can derive:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{If } (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}}^* (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{INCOMPLETE}) \\ \text{then } (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{COMPLETE}) \end{array}$$

Essentially, COMPLETENESS allows us to return the completeness flag that was lost due to a POSTULATE or GENERALIZATION step, once we have managed to remove all the added / generalized lemma equations. In practice, a tool or human prover might have a derivation that could be denoted $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\text{POSTULATE}) (\mathcal{E} \cup$

$\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}, \text{INCOMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \dots \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}', \text{INCOMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri (COMPLETENESS)}} (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}', \text{COMPLETE})$ by remembering the set $\mathcal{E}$ where the completeness flag was lost.

There are many other potential inference rules we could consider, as various extensions of the base method have been studied in the literature (see e.g. [Bouhoula 1997]). For now, we stick to these nine rules, as they suffice on our example set.

4.3. Soundness and Completeness of Rewriting Induction

These inference rules are used for *rewriting induction* by the following theorem:

THEOREM 4.2. *Let an LCTRS with rules $\mathcal{R}$ and signature Σ , satisfying the restrictions from Section 4.1, be given. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a finite set of equations and let $\text{flag} = \text{COMPLETE}$ if we can confirm that $\mathcal{R}$ is confluent (that is, if $s \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$, then there is some u with $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$) and $\text{flag} = \text{INCOMPLETE}$ otherwise. If $(\mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}}^* (\emptyset, \mathcal{H}, \text{flag}')$ for some $\mathcal{H}, \text{flag}'$, then every equation in $\mathcal{E}$ is an inductive theorem of $\mathcal{R}$. If $(\mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}}^* \perp$, then there is some equation in $\mathcal{E}$ which is not an inductive theorem of $\mathcal{R}$.*

In Section 4.4, we will see how to use this result in practice. Now, let us first prove the theorem. To this end, we follow the proof method of [Sakata et al. 2009], which builds on the original proof idea in [Reddy 1990]. Given a set $\mathcal{E}$ of equations, let $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ denote the *derivation relation* of $\mathcal{E}$, defined as follows:

$$C[s\gamma]_p \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} C[t\gamma]_p \text{ if } s \approx t [\varphi] \in \mathcal{E} \text{ or } t \approx s [\varphi] \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ and } \gamma \text{ respects } \varphi$$

The proof is split up into several auxiliary lemmas. To start, we observe:

LEMMA 4.3. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- all equations in $\mathcal{E}$ are inductive theorems;
- $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ on ground terms (so if s, t are ground and $s \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} t$, then also $s \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$).

PROOF. Suppose $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ on ground terms. If $s \approx t [\varphi] \in \mathcal{E}$ and ground constructor substitution γ respects this equation, then $s\gamma$ and $t\gamma$ are ground. Since obviously $s\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} t\gamma$ (with empty C), by assumption $s\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t\gamma$. Thus, $s \approx t [\varphi]$ is an inductive theorem.

Suppose that all equations in $\mathcal{E}$ are inductive theorems, and $u \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} w$ for ground u, w ; we must see that $u \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w$. We have $u = C[s\gamma]$ and $w = C[t\gamma]$ for some $s \approx t [\varphi] \in \mathcal{E}$ and substitution γ that respects φ and maps all variables in s, t to ground terms. Let δ be a substitution such that each $\delta(x)$ is a normal form of $\gamma(x)$; by termination of $\mathcal{R}$, such a δ exists, and by quasi-reductivity, it is a ground constructor substitution. As values are not reduced, also δ respects φ . Therefore $s\delta \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} t\delta$, which implies $s\delta \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t\delta$. We conclude: $C[s\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* C[s\delta] \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* C[t\delta] \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* C[t\gamma]$, giving the desired result. $\square$

The following lemma originates in [Sakata et al. 2009], which is adapted from [Reddy 1990; Koike and Toyama 2000].

LEMMA 4.4 ([SAKATA ET AL. 2009]). *Let $\rightarrow_1$ and $\rightarrow_2$ be binary relations over some set A . Then, $\leftrightarrow_1^* = \leftrightarrow_2^*$ if all of the following hold:*

- $\rightarrow_1 \subseteq \rightarrow_2$,
- $\rightarrow_2$ is well-founded, and
- $\rightarrow_2 \subseteq (\rightarrow_1 \cdot \rightarrow_2^* \cdot \leftrightarrow_1^* \cdot \leftrightarrow_2^*)$.

PROOF. It follows from $\rightarrow_1 \subseteq \rightarrow_2$ that $\leftrightarrow_1^* \subseteq \leftrightarrow_2^*$. To show that $\leftrightarrow_2^* \subseteq \leftrightarrow_1^*$, we prove $\rightarrow_2^* \subseteq \leftrightarrow_1^*$ by well-founded induction on $\rightarrow_2$. Since the base case $x \rightarrow_2^* x$ is clear, we suppose $x \rightarrow_2 y \rightarrow_2^* z$. As $\rightarrow_2 \subseteq (\rightarrow_1 \cdot \rightarrow_2^* \cdot \leftrightarrow_1^* \cdot \leftrightarrow_2^*)$ there must be some a, b, c such that $x \rightarrow_1 a \rightarrow_2^* b \leftrightarrow_1^* c \leftrightarrow_2^* y$. Since $\rightarrow_1 \subseteq \rightarrow_2$ (i.e., $x \rightarrow_2 a$), we can apply the induction hypothesis both on a and on y , so $a \leftrightarrow_1^* b \leftrightarrow_1^* c \leftrightarrow_1^* y$ and $y \leftrightarrow_1^* z$. Therefore, $x \leftrightarrow_1^* z$. $\square$

LEMMA 4.5. *Let s, t be terms, φ a constraint and p a position of s such that $s|_p$ has the form $f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ with f a defined symbol and all s_i constructor terms. Suppose that the variables in s, t, φ are distinct from those in the rules. Then:*

- (1) *For any ground constructor substitution γ which respects $s \approx t [\varphi]$ and any choice of $\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)$, we have:*

$$s\gamma \left(\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, p} \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)} \right) t\gamma$$

Here, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, p}$ indicates a reduction at position p with a rule in $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$.

- (2) *For any $s' \rightarrow t' [\varphi']$ in any choice of $\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)$ and any ground constructor substitution δ which respects $s' \approx t' [\varphi']$, we have:*

$$s'\delta \left(\leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}, p} \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\{s \approx t [\varphi]\}} \right) t'\delta$$

PROOF. $s\gamma|_p = s|_p\gamma = f(s_1\gamma, \dots, s_n\gamma)$, where all $s_i\gamma$ are ground constructor terms. Since f is defined, $f(\vec{s}\gamma)$ reduces by quasi-reductivity, which can only be a root reduction. Thus, $s\gamma = (s\gamma)[\ell\delta]_p$ for some rule $\ell \rightarrow r [\psi]$ and substitution δ which respects ψ . Since the rule variables are distinct from the ones in the equation, we can assume that δ is an extension of γ , so $s\gamma = s[\ell]_p\delta$. Clearly, both $\varphi\delta$ and $\psi\delta$ evaluate to $\top$.

Since δ unifies $s|_p$ and ℓ , there is a most general unifier η , so $s|_p\eta = \ell\eta$ and we can write $\delta = \delta' \circ \eta$ for some δ' . Now, by definition of constrained term reduction, any choice of $\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)$ has an element $s' \approx t' [\varphi']$ where we can write (for suitable u, η' etc.):

$$\begin{aligned} s\eta[\ell\eta]_p &\approx t\eta [\varphi\eta \wedge \psi\eta] \\ &\sim u[\ell\eta']_p \approx t'' [\varphi''] \\ \rightarrow_{\ell \rightarrow r[\psi], 1 \cdot p} u[r\eta']_p &\approx t'' [\varphi''] \\ &\sim s' \approx t' [\varphi'] \end{aligned}$$

Consider the “term” $s\delta \approx t\delta$. This is an instance of the first constrained term in this reduction, so by Theorem 2.7, this “term” reduces at position $1 \cdot p$ to $s'\delta'' \approx t'\delta''$ for some substitution δ'' which respects φ' . As the reduction happens inside $s\delta$, we see that $t\delta = t'\delta''$. Thus, $s\gamma = s\delta \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s'\delta'' \leftrightarrow_{\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)} t'\delta'' = t\delta = t\gamma$.

As for the second part, note that by definition of Expd there are a substitution γ and constraint ψ such that the constrained term $s\gamma \approx t\gamma [\varphi\eta \wedge \psi\eta]$ reduces to $s' \approx t' [\varphi']$ at position $1 \cdot p$. By Theorem 2.8, we find a substitution η which respects $\varphi\eta \wedge \psi\eta$, such that $s\gamma\eta \approx t\gamma\eta \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s'\delta \approx t'\delta$ at position $1 \cdot p$. Since the reduction takes place in the left part of $\approx$, we have $t\gamma\eta = t'\delta$ and $s\gamma\eta \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s'\delta$. We are done if also $s\gamma\eta \leftrightarrow_{s \approx t [\varphi]} t\gamma\eta$, which indeed holds because $\eta \circ \gamma$ respects φ (as $(\varphi\eta \wedge \psi\eta)\eta$ implies $\varphi\eta\eta$). $\square$

LEMMA 4.6. *Suppose that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{flag}')$ by any inference rule other than COMPLETENESS. Then,*

$$\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$$

on ground terms.

PROOF. It suffices to show that $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}'} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$ on ground terms. For all inference rules (except COMPLETENESS) either $\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}' = \emptyset$ or we can write $\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}' = \{s \approx t [\varphi]\}$. Consider which inference rule is applied for $\vdash_{\text{ri}}$.

- (SIMPLIFICATION). Suppose that $s \approx t [\varphi]$ is replaced by $u \approx t [\psi]$ where $s \approx t [\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} u \approx t [\psi]$. Let $C[s\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{\{s \approx t [\varphi]\}} C[t\gamma]$, where γ is a substitution which respects φ . It follows from Theorem 2.7 that $s\gamma \approx t\gamma \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} u\delta \approx t\delta$ where δ is a substitution which respects ψ , and thus, as $\approx$ is a constructor, $C[s\gamma] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} C[u\delta]$ and $t\gamma = t\delta$. Then, $C[u\delta] \leftrightarrow_{\{u \approx t [\psi]\}} C[t\delta] = C[t\gamma]$, and we have $C[s\gamma] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} C[t\gamma]$. Symmetrically,

- if $C[t\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{\{s \simeq t [\varphi]\}} C[s\gamma]$, then $C[t\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} C[s\gamma]$. Thus, $\leftrightarrow_{s \simeq t [\varphi]} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*)$. This suffices because in this case $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}'$.
- (DELETION). In the case that $s = t$, the relation $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}'}$ is the identity. Otherwise, φ is unsatisfiable, so $s \simeq t [\varphi]$ is never used, i.e., $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}'} = \emptyset$.
 - (EXPANSION). Suppose $C[s\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{s \simeq t [\varphi]} C[t\gamma]$, where γ respects $s \simeq t [\varphi]$; as we only consider ground terms, $\gamma(x)$ is ground for all variables in its domain. Noting that by quasi-reductivity and termination every term reduces to a ground constructor term, let δ be a substitution where each $\delta(x)$ in $\text{Dom}(\gamma)$ is a constructor term such that $\gamma(x) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \delta(x)$. It follows from Lemma 4.5 that $C[s\gamma] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* C[s\delta] (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} C[t\delta] \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* C[t\gamma])$. The situation where $C[t\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{s \simeq t [\varphi]} C[s\gamma]$ is symmetric.
 - (EQ-DELETION). Let $s = C[s_1, \dots, s_n]$ and $t = C[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ where $s_1, t_1, \dots, s_n, t_n \in \text{Terms}(\Sigma_{\text{theory}}, \text{Var}(\varphi))$. Any ground substitution γ which respects φ and whose domain contains all variables in the s_i and t_i must map these variables to values. Therefore, $s_i\gamma \rightarrow_{\text{calc}}^* v_i$ and $t_i\gamma \rightarrow_{\text{calc}}^* w_i$, where v_i is the value of $s_i\gamma$ and w_i is the value of $t_i\gamma$. Now, suppose $q \leftrightarrow_{s \simeq t [\varphi]} u$ for ground q, u . Then $q = D[C[s_1, \dots, s_n]]\gamma$ and $u = D[C[t_1, \dots, t_n]]\gamma$ for some ground γ which respects φ , or $u = D[C[\vec{t}]]\gamma$ and $q = D[C[\vec{s}]]\gamma$. In the former case, $q \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* D\gamma[C\gamma[v_1, \dots, v_n]]$ and $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* D\gamma[C\gamma[w_1, \dots, w_n]]$. If each $v_i = w_i$, then clearly $q \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$. Otherwise, $(\varphi \wedge \neg(s_1 = t_1 \wedge \dots \wedge s_n = t_n))\gamma$ is valid, so we easily get the desired $q \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$. The latter case is symmetric.
 - (DISPROVE) In this case we do not have $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, b) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', b')$.
 - (CONSTRUCTOR) Let $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$, $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, and suppose $C[s\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{\{s \simeq t [\varphi]\}} C[f(t\gamma)]$, where γ is a substitution which respects φ . Since $\mathcal{E}'$ contains all equations $s_i \approx t_i [\varphi]$, we have $C[s\gamma] = C[f(s_1\gamma, \dots, s_n\gamma)] \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} C[f(t_1\gamma, \dots, s_n\gamma)] \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \dots \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} C[f(t_1\gamma, \dots, t_n\gamma)] = C[t\gamma]$.
 - (POSTULATE) $\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}' = \emptyset$, so there is nothing to prove!
 - (GENERALIZATION) Suppose that $s \approx t [\varphi]$ is replaced by $s' \approx t' [\psi]$. Suppose that $C[s\gamma] \leftrightarrow_{\{s \simeq t [\varphi]\}} C[t\gamma]$ for some substitution γ which respects φ . Then there exists a substitution δ which respects ψ such that $C[s\gamma] = C[s'\delta] \leftrightarrow_{\{s' \approx t' [\psi]\}} C[t'\delta] = C[t\gamma]$. $\square$

LEMMA 4.7. *Suppose that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{flag}')$ by any inference rule other than COMPLETENESS. If*

$$\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*)$$

on ground terms, then

$$\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$$

on ground terms.

PROOF. It suffices to consider the case that EXPANSION is applied (for the other cases, we use Lemma 4.6). Suppose that $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{H}' \setminus \mathcal{H}} t$. Then, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that $s (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*) t$, and hence:

$$s (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*) t$$

$\square$

LEMMA 4.8. *Suppose that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \dots \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{flag}')$. Then:*

- (1) $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$ *on ground terms,*
- (2) *if $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*)$ on ground terms, then*

$$\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$$

on ground terms, and

- (3) *if $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}$ is terminating, then so is $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'$.*

PROOF. We prove the statements by induction on the number of $\vdash_{\text{ri}}$ steps, where steps in the premise of a COMPLETENESS step are also counted. The base case is evident, so suppose $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{H}_1, \text{flag}_1) \vdash_{\text{ri}}^* (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{flag}')$.

- (1) If the first step uses inference rule COMPLETENESS, then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}}^* (\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{H}_1, \text{INCOMPLETE})$ in fewer steps, so by the induction hypothesis:

$$\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}_1}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_1} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}_1}^*)$$

If the first step uses another inference rule, this same property follows from Lemma 4.6. By the induction hypothesis we have

$$\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_1} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$$

on ground terms. It follows from $\mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}'$ that

$$\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_1} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$$

By replacing $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_1}$ with $(\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$, we have that

$$\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \left(\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot \left(\begin{array}{c} (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*) \\ \cup \\ = \end{array} \right) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \right)$$

and hence $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*)$.

- (2) Assume $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*)$ on ground terms. By the induction hypothesis (in case of COMPLETENESS) or Lemma 4.7 (otherwise),

$$\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}_1} \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}_1}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_1} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}_1}^*)$$

We complete by the induction hypothesis on $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{H}_1, \text{flag}_1) \vdash_{\text{ri}}^* (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{flag}')$.

- (3) Trivial with the induction hypothesis, with the first step using either the induction hypothesis again (in case of COMPLETENESS), the definition of EXPANSION, or the observation that other inference rules do not alter $\mathcal{H}$. $\square$

This leaves the way free for the first part of Theorem 4.2.

LEMMA 4.9. *If $(\mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \text{flag}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \dots \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\emptyset, \mathcal{H}, \text{flag}')$, then every equation in $\mathcal{E}$ is an inductive theorem of $\mathcal{R}$.*

PROOF. It is clear that $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}$. It follows from Lemma 4.8 that:

- $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*$ on ground terms,
- $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*$ on ground terms, and
- $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}$ is terminating.

By Lemma 4.4 (as equality is included in $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$) we find that $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* = \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*$, and hence $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$, on ground terms. We complete with Lemma 4.3. $\square$

Moving on to *disproving*, we need two auxiliary lemmas:

LEMMA 4.10. *If $\mathcal{R}$ is confluent and $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \perp$, then $\mathcal{E}$ contains an equation $s \approx t[\varphi]$ which is not an inductive theorem.*

PROOF. By confluence and termination together, we can speak of *the* normal form $u \downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ of any term u ; if u is ground, then by quasi-reductivity its normal form is a ground constructor term. A property of confluence is that if $w \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* q$, then $w \downarrow_{\mathcal{R}} = q \downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$. So, it suffices to prove that for some $s \approx t[\varphi] \in \mathcal{E}$ there is a ground constructor substitution γ which respects this equation, such that $s\gamma$ and $t\gamma$ have distinct normal forms.

The only inference rule that could be used to obtain $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \perp$ is DISPROVE, so $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}' \cup \{s \approx t[\varphi]\}$ and one of the following holds:

- (1) $s, t \in \text{Terms}(\Sigma_{\text{theory}}, \mathcal{V})$ with $\varphi \wedge s \neq t$ satisfiable. That is, there is a substitution γ mapping all variables in the equation to values, such that $\varphi\gamma$ is valid and $s\gamma$ and $t\gamma$ reduce to different values by $\rightarrow_{\text{calc}}$. We are done since all values are normal forms.
- (2) $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ and $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ with f and g different constructors, and φ is satisfiable, so there is a substitution δ mapping all variables in φ to values such that $\varphi\delta$ is valid. Let γ be an extension of δ which additionally maps all other variables in s, t to ground terms (by assumption, ground instances of all variables exist). Then $\varphi\gamma$ is still valid, and $s\gamma$ and $t\gamma$ are ground terms with $s\gamma \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* (s\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}} = f((\vec{s}\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) \neq g((\vec{t}\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) = (t\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t\gamma$.
- (3) $s : \iota$ is a variable not occurring in φ , φ is satisfiable, there are at least two different constructors f, g with output sort ι and either t is a variable distinct from s or t has a constructor symbol at the root. By satisfiability of φ , a substitution δ exists whose domain does not contain s , with $\varphi\delta$ valid. If t is a variable, let γ be an extension of δ mapping s to some ground term rooted by f and t to a ground term rooted by g (by assumption ground instances always exist). If $t = f(\vec{t})$, then let γ be an extension of δ mapping s to some ground term rooted by g , and mapping all other variables in t to ground terms as well. Either way, $\varphi\gamma$ is valid and $(s\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \neq (t\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$. $\square$

LEMMA 4.11. *Suppose $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}$ is terminating, and also $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}}^*$. If, moreover, $\mathcal{R}$ is confluent, $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{COMPLETE})$, and $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \cup \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ on ground terms, then $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{H}'} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ on ground terms.*

PROOF. Assume that all conditions are satisfied; we consider the inference rule used to derive $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{COMPLETE})$.

First, suppose the rule used was COMPLETENESS, so $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}}^* (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}', \text{INCOMPLETE})$ and $\mathcal{E}' \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. As we have assumed that $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \cup \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$, certainly $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$. As for $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{H}'}$, Lemma 4.8 gives us that $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^* \cdot (\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \cup =) \cdot \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}^*$, so (using again that $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}'} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$) we can apply Lemma 4.4 and termination of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'}$ to obtain $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{H}'} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}'} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$.

Alternatively, suppose a different rule was applied. Then each element in $\mathcal{H}'$ either also belongs to $\mathcal{H}$ or (in the case of EXPANSION) corresponds to an equation in $\mathcal{E}$. Thus, $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{H}'} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{H}} \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$. So let $s \approx t$ $[\varphi] \in \mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E}$; we must see that $\leftrightarrow_{\{s \approx t [\varphi]\}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$. By Lemma 4.3, it suffices if for all ground constructor substitutions γ which respect this equation, $s\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t\gamma$. We fix γ and use a case analysis on the applied inference rule.

- (SIMPLIFICATION). There is $s' \simeq t'$ $[\varphi'] \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $s' \approx t'$ $[\varphi'] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} s \approx t$ $[\varphi]$ at position $1.p$. By Theorem 2.8, we can find δ which respects φ' such that $s'\delta \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}} s\gamma$ at position p and $t'\delta = t\gamma$. As $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ by the assumption, $s\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* s'\delta \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} t'\delta = t\gamma$, which suffices because $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$.
- (DELETION). No equations are added in this case.
- (EXPANSION). There is $s' \simeq t'$ $[\varphi'] \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $s \approx t$ $[\varphi] \in \text{Expd}(s', t', \varphi', p)$ for some p . By Lemma 4.5(2), we have $s\gamma (\leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}) t\gamma$, which suffices because $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$.
- (EQ-DELETION) $s \simeq t$ $[\varphi'] \in \mathcal{E}$, where $\varphi = \varphi' \wedge \neg(s_1 = t_1 \wedge \dots \wedge s_n = t_n)$, and $s = C[s_1, \dots, s_n]$, $t = C[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ for some $C, \vec{s}, \vec{t}$. Since any substitution which respects φ also respects φ' , we must have $s\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} t\gamma$, so $s\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t\gamma$.
- (DISPROVE) A reduction with this rule does not have the required form.
- (CONSTRUCTOR) There is $f(\dots, s, \dots) \approx f(\dots, t, \dots)$ $[\varphi] \in \mathcal{E}$, and by assumption $f(\dots, s, \dots)\gamma \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* f(\dots, t, \dots)\gamma$. By confluence, this means that $f(\dots, s\gamma, \dots)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}} = f(\dots, t\gamma, \dots)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, which implies that $(s\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}} = (t\gamma)\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$.
- (POSTULATE, GENERALIZATION) A reduction with these rules does not have the form required by the lemma (as the COMPLETE flag is removed). $\square$

Now we are ready for the second part of Theorem 4.2:

LEMMA 4.12. *If $\mathcal{R}$ is confluent, and $(\mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \text{COMPLETE}) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \dots \vdash_{\text{ri}} \perp$, then there is some equation in $\mathcal{E}$ which is not an inductive theorem of $\mathcal{R}$.*

PROOF. If $(\mathcal{E}, \emptyset, \text{COMPLETE}) = (\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{H}_1, \text{flag}_1) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \dots \vdash_{\text{ri}} (\mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{H}_n, \text{flag}_n) \vdash_{\text{ri}} \perp$, then we easily see that $\text{flag}_i = \text{COMPLETE}$ for all i . By Lemma 4.10, $\mathcal{E}_n$ contains an equation $s \approx t [\varphi]$ which is not an inductive theorem. Then $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_n} \not\subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ on ground terms. By Lemma 4.11, Lemma 4.8 and induction on $n - i$, this means that $\leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \cup \leftrightarrow_{\emptyset} \not\subseteq \leftrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ on ground terms, so by Lemma 4.3, not all $e \in \mathcal{E}$ are inductive theorems. $\square$

Thus we obtain:

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Immediately by Lemmas 4.9 and 4.12. $\square$

4.4. An Illustrative Example

Example 4.13. To show how the method works, consider $\mathcal{R}_{\text{sum}}$, the LCTRS with the two correct implementations of the motivating Example 1.1.

- (1) $\text{sum1}(\text{arr}, n) \rightarrow \text{u}(\text{arr}, n, 0, 0)$
- (2) $\text{u}(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret}, i) \rightarrow \text{error} \quad [i < n \wedge (i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(\text{arr}))]$
- (3) $\text{u}(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret}, i) \rightarrow \text{u}(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret} + \text{select}(\text{arr}, i), i + 1) \quad [i < n \wedge 0 \leq i < \text{size}(\text{arr})]$
- (4) $\text{u}(\text{arr}, n, \text{ret}, i) \rightarrow \text{return}(\text{arr}, \text{ret}) \quad [i \geq n]$
- (5) $\text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k) \rightarrow \text{return}(\text{arr}, 0) \quad [k \leq 0]$
- (6) $\text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k) \rightarrow \text{error} \quad [k - 1 \geq \text{size}(\text{arr})]$
- (7) $\text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k) \rightarrow \text{w}(\text{select}(\text{arr}, k - 1), \text{sum4}(\text{arr}, k - 1)) \quad [0 \leq k - 1 < \text{size}(\text{arr})]$
- (8) $\text{w}(n, \text{error}) \rightarrow \text{error}$
- (9) $\text{w}(n, \text{return}(a, r)) \rightarrow \text{return}(a, n + r)$

Here, a constraint $x \leq y < b$ is shorthand notation for $x \leq y \wedge y < b$.

We want to see that these two implementations are equivalent, at least when the input makes sense, so the given length is at least 0 and does not exceed the array size. This is the case if the following equation is an inductive theorem:

$$(A) \text{sum1}(a, k) \approx \text{sum4}(a, k) \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a)]$$

Thus, we start the procedure with $(\{(A)\}, \emptyset, \text{COMPLETE})$. Since the aim in this case is to prove (rather than disprove) equivalence, we will henceforth omit the completeness flag. To start, we apply SIMPLIFICATION and obtain:

$$(\{(B) \text{u}(a, k, 0, 0) \approx \text{sum4}(a, k) \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a)]\}, \emptyset)$$

None of SIMPLIFICATION, EQ-DELETION, DELETION and CONSTRUCTOR is applicable, so we apply EXPANSION to the right-hand side of (B) at the root. Since $k \leq \text{size}(a)$ and $k - 1 \geq \text{size}(a)$ cannot both hold, the error rule leads to an unsatisfiable constraint. Therefore, this step only gives two new equations:

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (C) : \text{return}(a, 0) \approx \text{u}(a, k, 0, 0) \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge k \leq 0] \\ (D) : \text{w}(\text{select}(a, k - 1), \text{sum4}(a, k - 1)) \approx \text{u}(a, k, 0, 0) \\ \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge 0 \leq k - 1 < \text{size}(a)] \end{array} \right\}, \{(B^{-1})\} \right)$$

Here, (B^{-1}) should be read as the rule generated from the inverse of (B), so:

$$(B^{-1}) \text{sum4}(a, k) \rightarrow \text{u}(a, k, 0, 0) \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a)]$$

We use SIMPLIFICATION with rule (4) to reduce (C) to $\text{return}(a, 0) \approx \text{return}(a, 0) [\dots]$, which we quickly delete. $(\{(D)\}, \{(B^{-1})\})$ remains. Simplifying the right-hand side of (D) with rule (3), we obtain $(\{(E)\}, \{(B^{-1})\})$, with:

$$(E) : \text{w}(\text{select}(a, k - 1), \text{sum4}(a, k - 1)) \approx \text{u}(a, k, 0 + \text{select}(a, 0), 0 + 1) \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge 0 \leq k - 1 < \text{size}(a)]$$

Next we use SIMPLIFICATION with the calculation rules. As these rules are irregular, this requires some care. There are three standard ways to do this:

- if $s \rightarrow_{\text{calc}} t$ then $s[\varphi] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t[\varphi]$, e.g. $f(0+1) \approx r[\varphi]$ reduces to $f(1) \approx r[\varphi]$;
- a calculation can be replaced by a fresh variable, which is defined in the constraint, e.g. $f(x+1) \approx r[\varphi]$ reduces to $f(y) \approx r[\varphi \wedge y = x+1]$;
- a calculation *already* defined in the constraint can be replaced by the relevant variable, e.g. $f(x+1) \approx r[\varphi \wedge y = x+1]$ reduces to $f(y) \approx r[\varphi \wedge y = x+1]$.

These ways are not functionally different; if an equation e reduces both to e_1 and e_2 with a calculation at the same position, then it is easy to see that $e_1 \sim e_2$.

We can do more: recall that, by the definition of constrained term reduction, we can rewrite a constraint φ with variables $\vec{x}, \vec{y}$ in a constrained term $s[\varphi]$ with $\text{Var}(s) \cap \{\vec{y}\} = \emptyset$, to any constraint ψ over $\vec{x}, \vec{z}$ such that $\exists \vec{y}[\varphi]$ is equivalent to $\exists \vec{z}[\psi]$. We primarily use this observation to write the constraint in a simpler form after SIMPLIFICATION or EXPANSION, for instance by removing redundant clauses.

Using six more SIMPLIFICATION steps with the calculation rules on (E), and writing the constraint in a simpler form, we obtain:

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(F)} : \quad w(n, \text{sum4}(a, k')) \approx u(a, k, r, 1) \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge \\ \quad 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r = 0 + \text{select}(a, 0)] \end{array} \right\}, \{ \text{(B}^{-1}) \} \right)$$

Then, using SIMPLIFICATION with the induction rule (B⁻¹):

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(G)} : \quad w(n, u(a, k', 0, 0)) \approx u(a, k, r, 1) \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge \\ \quad 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r = 0 + \text{select}(a, 0)] \end{array} \right\}, \{ \text{(B}^{-1}) \} \right)$$

Once more, our only choice (aside from generalizing or adding additional equations) is EXPANSION. We expand in the right-hand side, obtaining:

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(H)} : \quad u(a, k, r + \text{select}(a, 1), 1+1) \approx w(n, u(a, k', 0, 0)) \\ \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge \\ \quad r = 0 + \text{select}(a, 0) \wedge 1 < k \wedge 0 \leq 1 < \text{size}(a)] \\ \text{(I)} : \quad \text{return}(a, r) \approx w(n, u(a, k', 0, 0)) \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge \\ \quad 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r = 0 + \text{select}(a, 0) \\ \quad \wedge 1 \geq k] \end{array} \right\}, \{ \text{(B}^{-1}), \text{(G}^{-1}) \} \right)$$

We have again omitted the error rule, as the corresponding constraint is not satisfiable. For (I), the constraint implies that $k = 1$, so SIMPLIFICATION with rule (4) followed by (9) and restructuring the constraint, gives:

$$\text{return}(a, r) \approx \text{return}(a, n+0) \quad [k'=0 < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r = \text{select}(a, 0)]$$

Using EQ-DELETION, we can reduce this to an equation with a constraint $k' = 0 < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r = \text{select}(a, 0) \wedge \neg(r = n+0)$, which is unsatisfiable. The resulting equation is removed with DELETION.

We continue with $(\{(H)\}, \{(\text{B}^{-1}), (\text{G}^{-1})\})$. After applications of SIMPLIFICATION with rule (3) and calculation rules, we obtain $(\{(J)\}, \{(\text{B}^{-1}), (\text{G}^{-1})\})$:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{(J)} : \quad u(a, k, r_1, 2) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r, 1)) \\ \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' \wedge 1 < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge \\ \quad r = 0 + \text{select}(a, 0) \wedge r_1 = r + \text{select}(a, 1)] \end{array}$$

Here, we have used the third style of calculation simplification to reuse r .

Again we use EXPANSION, now on the left-hand side; two of the resulting equations are quickly deleted; for the third, repeated SIMPLIFICATION leads to:

$$(K): \quad \begin{aligned} &u(a, k, r_2, 3) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_1, 2)) \\ &[k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq k' \wedge 2 < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge \\ &r = 0 + \text{select}(a, 0) \wedge r_1 = r + \text{select}(a, 1) \wedge r_2 = r_1 + \text{select}(a, 2)] \end{aligned}$$

But now a pattern starts to arise. If we continue like this, simplifying as long as we can, and then using whichever of the other core rules is applicable, we get:

$$(L): u(a, k, r_3, 4) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_2, 3)) \quad [k' = k - 1 \wedge 3 < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge \dots]$$

$$(M): u(a, k, r_4, 5) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_3, 4)) \quad [k' = k - 1 \wedge 4 < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge \dots]$$

That is, we have a *divergence*: a sequence of increasingly complex equations, each generated from the same leg in an EXPANSION (see also the *divergence critic* in [Walsh 1996]). Yet the previous induction rules never apply to the new equation. We will need to generalize the equation to finish this proof.

So, consider the following equation (we will say more about it in Section 5):

$$(N): u(a, k, r, i) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r', i')) \quad [k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq i' < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge \\ i' = i - 1 \wedge r = r' + \text{select}(a, i') \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k')]$$

It is easy to see that (K) is an instance of (N); we apply GENERALIZATION and continue with $(\{(N)\}, \{(B^{-1}), (G^{-1}), (J)\})$.¹⁴ Using EXPANSION, we obtain:

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (O): \quad \text{error} \approx w(n, u(a, k', r', i')) \quad [k' = k - 1 \wedge \\ \quad 0 \leq i' < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge i' = i - 1 \wedge r = r' + \text{select}(a, i') \wedge \\ \quad n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge i < k \wedge (i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(a))] \\ (P): \quad u(a, k, r + \text{select}(a, i), i + 1) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r', i')) \\ \quad [k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq i' < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge i' = i - 1 \wedge r = r' + \\ \quad \text{select}(a, i') \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge i < k \wedge 0 \leq i < \text{size}(a)] \\ (Q): \quad \text{return}(a, r) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r', i')) \\ \quad [k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq i' < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge i' = i - 1 \wedge \\ \quad r = r' + \text{select}(a, i') \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge i \geq k] \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (B^{-1}) \\ (G^{-1}) \\ (J) \\ (N) \end{array} \right\} \right)$$

For clarity, we have included the equation (O) for the error rule, as it might not be immediately obvious that we can omit it. However, consider its constraint: $i < 0$ cannot hold if both $0 \leq i'$ and $i' = i - 1$. Also $i \geq \text{size}(a)$ cannot hold if both $i < k$ and $k \leq \text{size}(a)$. Thus, this constraint is unsatisfiable; we remove the equation with DELETION.

Consider (Q). The clauses $i \geq k$, $k' = k - 1$ and $i' = i - 1$ together provide $i' \geq k'$, so we can simplify the right-hand side with rules (4) and (9), giving:

$$\text{return}(a, r) \approx \text{return}(a, n + r') \quad [k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq i' < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge i' = i - 1 \wedge \\ r = r' + \text{select}(a, i') \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge i \geq k]$$

We apply EQ-DELETION. Since the constraint implies that $i' = k'$ and therefore $r = r' + n$, we can remove the resulting equation using DELETION.

Only (P) remains. We simplify this equation with $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$, giving:

$$(R) \quad \begin{aligned} &u(a, k, r'', i'') \approx w(n, u(a, k', r, i)) \\ &[k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq i' < k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge i' = i - 1 \wedge r = r' + \text{select}(a, i') \wedge \\ &n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge i < k \wedge 0 \leq i < \text{size}(a) \wedge i'' = i + 1 \wedge r'' = r + \text{select}(a, i)] \end{aligned}$$

¹⁴By a slight abuse of notation and in the interest of readability, we write e.g. (J), which we had introduced as an equation in the proof state, also for the corresponding rule in the proof state where $\approx$ is replaced by $\rightarrow$. So it depends on the context whether an identifier for a triple of two terms and a constraint denotes an equation or a rule in a proof state.

But now the induction rule (N) applies! As this rule is irregular, we must be careful. We use the following substitution for the constrained reduction step: $\gamma = [a := a, k := k, r := r'', i := i'', n := n, k' := k', r' := r, i' := i]$. Note that this substitution also affects variables not occurring in the left-hand side! Using SIMPLIFICATION, the equation is reduced to $w(n, u(a, k', r, i)) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r, i)) [\dots]$, which is removed using DELETION.

Since we have successfully reduced $(\{(A)\}, \emptyset)$ to $(\emptyset, \{(B^{-1}), (G^{-1}), (J), (N)\})$, the original equation (A) is an inductive theorem.

4.5. Correctness of String Functions

Example 4.14. For another example, let us look at an assignment to implement `strlen`, a string function which operates on 0-terminated char arrays. Following Section 3.6, we limit interest to *statically allocated* arrays, so without pointer arithmetic beyond indexing array elements. As `char` is a numeric data type, we use integer arrays in the LCTRS translation again (although using another underlying sort $\mathcal{I}_{\text{char}}$ would make little difference).

The example function and its LCTRS translation are as follows:

```
int strlen(char *str) {
  for (int i = 0; ; i++) {
    if (str[i] == 0) return i;
  }
}
```

- (1) $\text{strlen}(x) \rightarrow u(x, 0)$
- (2) $u(x, i) \rightarrow \text{error} \quad [i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(x)]$
- (3) $u(x, i) \rightarrow \text{return}(i) \quad [0 \leq i < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, i) = 0]$
- (4) $u(x, i) \rightarrow u(x, i + 1) \quad [0 \leq i < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, i) \neq 0]$

Note that the bounds checks guarantee termination.

To see that `strlen` does what we would expect it to do, we want to know that for *valid C-strings*, `strlen(a)` returns the first integer i such that $a[i] = 0$. As stated in Section 1.2, this corresponds to the following equation being an inductive theorem:

$$(A) \quad \text{strlen}(x) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0]$$

Here, we use bounded quantification, which, as described in Section 2.2, can be seen as syntactic sugar for an additional predicate; the underlying LCTRS could instead use a symbol `nonzero_until`, and replace $\forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0]$ by `nonzero_until(x, n)` in the constraint.

Starting with $(\{(A)\}, \emptyset)$, we first use SIMPLIFICATION using rule (1):

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (B) \quad u(x, 0) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0] \end{array} \right\}, \emptyset \right)$$

We continue with EXPANSION, again on the left-hand side (as there is little we can do on the right-hand side at all); since the constraint implies that $0 < \text{size}(x)$ the error case (2) is unsatisfiable, so we only obtain two new equations:

$$\left(\left(\begin{array}{l} (C) \quad \text{return}(0) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 \leq 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) = 0] \\ (D) \quad u(x, 0 + 1) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 \leq 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0] \end{array} \right), \{(B)\} \right)$$

As the constraint of (C) implies that $n = 0$ (because of the quantification and $\text{select}(x, 0) = 0$), we can remove (C) using EQ-DELETION and DELETION.

As for (D), we simplify with a calculation:

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(E)} \quad u(x, 1) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0] \end{array} \right\}, \{ \text{(B)} \} \right)$$

And expand again (once more skipping the error case due to unsatisfiability):

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(F)} \quad \text{return}(1) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ 0 \leq 1 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 1) = 0] \\ \text{(G)} \quad u(x, 1+1) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ 0 \leq 1 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 1) \neq 0] \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(B)} \\ \text{(E)} \end{array} \right\} \right)$$

The constraint of (F) implies that $n = 1$, so we easily remove this equation. (G) is simplified using a calculation (to (G'), say), and then expanded again:

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(H)} \quad \text{return}(2) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge 1 < \\ \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 1) \neq 0 \wedge 2 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 2) = 0] \\ \text{(I)} \quad u(x, 2+1) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge 1 < \\ \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 1) \neq 0 \wedge 2 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 2) \neq 0] \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(B)} \\ \text{(E)} \\ \text{(G')} \end{array} \right\} \right)$$

Again, we drop (H) easily. Simplifying (I) and reformulating its constraint, we obtain:

$$\text{(I')} \quad u(x, 3) \approx \text{return}(n) \quad [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 \leq 2 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall j \in \{0, \dots, 2\} [\text{select}(x, j) \neq 0]]$$

Note that we grouped together the $\neq 0$ statements into a quantification, which looks a lot like the other quantification in the constraint. Now, let's generalize! We will use the generalized equation (J): $u(x, k) \approx \text{return}(n) \ [\varphi]$, where:

$$\varphi : [k = m+1 \wedge 0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 \leq m < \text{size}(x) \wedge \forall j \in \{0, \dots, m\} [\text{select}(x, j) \neq 0]]$$

Obviously, (I') is an instance of (J); we use EXPANSION to obtain:

$$\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(K)} \quad \text{error} \approx \text{return}(n) \ [\varphi \wedge (k < 0 \vee k \geq \text{size}(x))] \\ \text{(L)} \quad \text{return}(k) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [\varphi \wedge 0 \leq k < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, k) = 0] \\ \text{(M)} \quad u(x, k+1) \approx \text{return}(n) \\ [\varphi \wedge 0 \leq k < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, k) \neq 0] \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(B)} \\ \text{(E)} \\ \text{(G')} \\ \text{(J)} \end{array} \right\} \right)$$

Note that the two $\forall$ statements in φ , together with $\text{select}(x, n) = 0$, imply that $m < n$, so that $k \leq n$. Consequently, the constraint of (K) is unsatisfiable: $k = m+1$ and $0 \leq m$ together imply that $k < 0$ cannot hold, and since $k \leq n$, we see that $k \geq \text{size}(x)$ cannot hold in combination with $n < \text{size}(x)$. By DELETION, we may remove (K).

For (L), we use EQ-DELETION. In addition to $k \leq n$, we note that the two $\forall$ statements together with $\text{select}(x, k) = 0$ imply that $n-1 < k$, so $n \leq k$. Thus, $n = k$, and the resulting constraint is unsatisfiable; we remove the equation using DELETION.

Finally, consider (M). Simplifying this equation with a calculation, and reformulating the constraint, we have:

$$(M') \quad u(x, p) \approx \text{return}(n) \quad [p = k + 1 \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge \\ \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge 0 \leq k < \text{size}(x) \wedge \\ \forall j \in \{0, \dots, k\} [\text{select}(x, j) \neq 0] \wedge \text{some constraints on } m]$$

This equation is simplified to an equation of the form $\text{return}(n) \approx \text{return}(n) [\dots]$ using the induction rule (J); we complete with DELETION.

Example 4.15. Now recall the strcpy function from Example 3.9.

```
void strcpy(char goal[], char original[]) {
  int i = 0;
  for (; original[i] != 0; i++) goal[i] = original[i];
  goal[i] = 0;
}
```

$$\begin{aligned} (5) \quad & \text{strcpy}(x, y) \rightarrow v(x, y, 0) \\ (6) \quad & v(x, y, i) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}} \quad [i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(y)] \\ (7) \quad & v(x, y, i) \rightarrow w(x, y, i) \quad [0 \leq i < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(y, i) = 0] \\ (8) \quad & v(x, y, i) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}} \quad [0 \leq i < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(y, i) \neq 0 \wedge i \geq \text{size}(x)] \\ (9) \quad & v(x, y, i) \rightarrow v(\text{store}(x, i, \text{select}(y, i)), y, i + 1) \\ & \quad [0 \leq i < \text{size}(x) \wedge i < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(y, i) \neq 0] \\ (10) \quad & w(x, y, i) \rightarrow \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}} \quad [i < 0 \vee i \geq \text{size}(x)] \\ (11) \quad & w(x, y, i) \rightarrow \text{return}_{\text{strcpy}}(\text{store}(x, i, 0)) \quad [0 \leq i < \text{size}(x)] \end{aligned}$$

To see that this implementation is correct, there are two things we can do. We could, as before, check equivalence against a trusted implementation of strcpy. Alternatively, like with strlen, we could prove a formal correctness criterion. Then we must show: if a is an array of sufficient size, and b a valid C-string, then $\text{strcpy}(a, b)$ updates a to correspond, as a C-string, to b . To do this, we introduce a new symbol test and two rules:

$$\begin{aligned} (12) \quad & \text{test}(x, n, \text{error}) \rightarrow \text{false} \\ (13) \quad & \text{test}(x, n, \text{return}(y)) \rightarrow \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n\} [\text{select}(x, i) = \text{select}(y, i)] \end{aligned}$$

Correctness of strcpy follows if the following equation is an inductive theorem:

$$(N) \quad \text{test}(x, n, \text{strcpy}(y, x)) \approx \text{true} \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0]]$$

The proof of this follows roughly the same lines as the recursive proof of strlen, and is found automatically by our tool (see Section 6); let us present here the main steps (but without keeping track of induction rules which are not used).

The first step is SIMPLIFICATION at position 3.

$$(O) \quad \text{test}(x, n, v(y, x, 0)) \approx \text{true} \\ [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0]]$$

We apply EXPANSION at the same position; the error rules both give an unsatisfiable constraint (because of $0 \leq n < \text{size}(x)$ and $n < \text{size}(y)$), so can be omitted. We obtain two new equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (P) \quad & \text{test}(x, n, w(y, x, 0)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) = 0] \\ (Q) \quad & \text{test}(x, n, v(\text{store}(y, 0, \text{select}(x, 0)), x, 0 + 1)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge 0 < \text{size}(y) \wedge 0 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0] \end{aligned}$$

Using SIMPLIFICATION with rules (11) and (13) on (P), we obtain an equation that can easily be removed with a combination of EQ-DELETION and DELETION, as the constraint implies that $n = 0$. As for (Q), note that the $0 < \text{size}(x)$ and $0 < \text{size}(y)$ clauses are redundant as $0 \leq n$. We simplify the equation with calculations, obtaining:

$$(R) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{test}(x, n, v(z, x, 1)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge k = \text{select}(x, 0) \wedge z = \text{store}(y, 0, k)] \end{aligned}$$

This constraint is somewhat awkward to reason with; in particular the store relation between y and z . However, observing that y only occurs in the constraint now, and not in the main part of the equation, we can reformulate the constraint:

$$(R') \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{test}(x, n, v(z, x, 1)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(z) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge k = \text{select}(x, 0) \wedge \text{select}(z, 0) = k] \end{aligned}$$

Or, even simpler, since k also plays only a limited role, we drop it:

$$(R'') \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{test}(x, n, v(z, x, 1)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(z) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) = \text{select}(z, 0)] \end{aligned}$$

We use EXPANSION again. Noting that the $\text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0$ clause together with the quantification implies that $n \geq 1$, neither of the error-rules gives a satisfiable constraint, and the equation resulting from rule (7) is quickly simplified, eq-deleted and deleted away. This leaves the equation resulting from rule (9):

$$(S) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{test}(x, n, v(\text{store}(z, 1, \text{select}(x, 1)), x, 1+1)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(z) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) = \text{select}(z, 0) \wedge \\ & 0 \leq 1 < \text{size}(z) \wedge 1 < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, 1) \neq 0] \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying with calculations, and then restructuring the constraint as before:

$$(S') \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{test}(x, n, v(a, x, 2)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(a) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) = 0] \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) = \text{select}(a, 0) \wedge \\ & \text{select}(x, 1) \neq 0 \wedge \text{select}(a, 1) = \text{select}(x, 1)] \end{aligned}$$

Note that here $a = \text{store}(z, 1, \text{select}(x, 1))$; the clause $\text{select}(x, 0) = \text{select}(z, 0)$ is replaced by $\text{select}(x, 0) = \text{select}(a, 0)$ because z and a correspond at position 0. Hence, the updated variable z plays no role, and was removed from the constraint.

But now we see a divergence arising. Using EXPANSION again, followed by SIMPLIFICATION as much as possible and restructuring the constraint, we obtain:

$$(T) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{test}(x, n, v(b, x, 3)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(b) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) \neq 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \text{select}(x, 0) = \text{select}(b, 0) \wedge \\ & \text{select}(x, 1) \neq 0 \wedge \text{select}(b, 1) = \text{select}(x, 1) \wedge \\ & \text{select}(x, 2) \neq 0 \wedge \text{select}(b, 2) = \text{select}(x, 2)] \end{aligned}$$

Let us reformulate this, by taking the similar statements into quantifications:

$$(T') \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{test}(x, n, v(b, x, 3)) \approx \text{true} \\ & [0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(b) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ & \forall i \in \{0, \dots, 2\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, 2\} [\text{select}(b, i) = \text{select}(x, i)]] \end{aligned}$$

We use GENERALIZATION, and create (U) $\text{test}(x, n, v(b, x, k)) \approx \text{true} [\varphi]$, where φ is:

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(b) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge 0 \leq k \wedge \\ &\quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ &\forall i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [\text{select}(b, i) = \text{select}(x, i)] \end{aligned}$$

Now, aside from the induction rule (U), EXPANSION gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(V)} \quad &\text{test}(x, n, \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}}) \approx \text{true} \quad [\varphi \wedge (k < 0 \vee k \geq \text{size}(x))] \\ \text{(W)} \quad &\text{test}(x, n, w(b, x, k)) \approx \text{true} \quad [\varphi \wedge 0 \leq k < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, k) = 0] \\ \text{(X)} \quad &\text{test}(x, n, \text{error}_{\text{strcpy}}) \approx \text{true} \quad [\varphi \wedge \dots \wedge k \geq \text{size}(b)] \\ \text{(Y)} \quad &\text{test}(x, n, v(\text{store}(b, k, \text{select}(x, k)), x, k+1)) \approx \text{true} \\ &\quad [\varphi \wedge 0 \leq k < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, k) \neq 0] \end{aligned}$$

As in the `strlen` case, we note that φ implies that $0 \leq k \leq n$. As φ additionally implies that $n < \text{size}(x)$ and $n < \text{size}(b)$, equations (V) and (X) both have unsatisfiable constraints. Thus, we remove them using DELETION.

For (W), note that the added clause $\text{select}(x, k) = 0$ together with the $\forall$ clauses implies $n \leq k$; thus we have $n = k$. This allows us to simplify with a calculation, and follow up with SIMPLIFICATIONS with rule (11) and (13), giving:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall i \in \{0, \dots, k\} [\text{select}(x, i) = \text{select}(y, i)] \approx \text{true} \\ &[\varphi \wedge 0 \leq k < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, k) = 0 \wedge y = \text{store}(b, k, 0)] \end{aligned}$$

We can reduce this with a calculation to $\text{true} \approx \text{true} [\dots]$, as the constraint implies that the quantification evaluates to true (the case for $i < k$ is given by the last quantification of φ , and the case for $i = k$ because $\text{select}(x, k) = \text{select}(y, k) = 0$).

As for (Y), let us simplify and reformulate the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Z)} \quad &\text{test}(x, n, v(y, x, k')) \approx \text{true} \\ &[0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \\ &\quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ &\forall i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [\text{select}(y, i) = \text{select}(x, i)] \wedge \\ &\quad 0 \leq k < \text{size}(x) \wedge \text{select}(x, k) \neq 0 \wedge k' = k+1 \wedge \text{select}(y, k) = \text{select}(x, k)] \end{aligned}$$

Or, taking clauses into the quantifications where possible:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Z')} \quad &\text{test}(x, n, v(y, x, k')) \approx \text{true} \\ &[0 \leq n < \text{size}(x) \wedge n < \text{size}(y) \wedge \text{select}(x, n) = 0 \wedge \\ &\forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \forall i \in \{0, \dots, k'-1\} [\text{select}(x, i) \neq 0] \wedge \\ &\quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, k'-1\} [\text{select}(y, i) = \text{select}(x, i)] \wedge 0 \leq k' \leq \text{size}(x)] \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying with induction rule (U), we obtain a trivial equation $\text{true} \approx \text{true} [\dots]$.

5. LEMMA GENERALIZATION BY DROPPING INITIALIZATIONS

Divergence, like we encountered in all three examples in Section 4, is very common in inductive theorem proving. As explained before, this is only natural: in mathematical proofs, when basic induction is insufficient to prove a theorem, we often need a more general claim to obtain a stronger induction hypothesis. As it is not always easy to find a suitable generalization, the (automatic) generation of suitable generalizations, and lemma equations for POSTULATE, has been extensively investigated [Bundy et al. 2005; Kapur and Sakhanenko 2003; Kapur and Subramaniam 1996; Nakabayashi et al. 2010; Urso and Kounalis 2004; Walsh 1996].

Here, we propose a new method, specialized for systems with constraints. The generalizations from Examples 4.13–4.15 were found using this technique. Although the method is very simple (at its core, we simply drop a part of the constraint), it is particularly effective for LCTRSs obtained from procedural programs.

5.1. Generalizing Initializations

Example 5.1. Let us state the rules of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{sum}}$ from Example 4.13 in an alternative way. Whenever the right-hand side of a rule has a subterm $f(\dots, n, \dots)$ with f a defined symbol and n a value, then we replace n by a fresh variable v_i and add $v_i = n$ to the constraint. In $\mathcal{R}_{\text{sum}}$ rules (2)–(9) are left unmodified, but (1) is replaced by:

$$(1') \text{ sum1}(arr, n) \rightarrow u(arr, n, v_1, v_2) \ [v_1 = 0 \wedge v_2 = 0]$$

Evidently, these rules generate the same rewrite relation as the original rules.

Now consider what happens if we use the same steps as in Example 4.13. The resulting induction has the same shape, but with more complex equations. Some instances:

$$\begin{aligned} (B') : & \quad u(a, k, v_1, v_2) \approx \text{sum4}(a, k) \\ & \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge v_1 = 0 \wedge v_2 = 0] \\ (E') : & \quad w(\text{select}(a, k-1), \text{sum4}(a, k-1)) \approx u(a, k, v_1 + \text{select}(a, v_2), v_2 + 1) \\ & \quad [0 \leq k \leq \text{size}(a) \wedge v_1 = 0 \wedge v_2 = 0 \wedge 0 \leq k-1 < \text{size}(a)] \\ (G') : & \quad w(n, u(a, k', v_1, v_2)) \approx u(a, k, r_0, i_0) \\ & \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge v_1 = 0 \wedge v_2 = 0 \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge \\ & \quad r_0 = v_1 + \text{select}(a, v_2) \wedge i_0 = v_2 + 1] \\ (J') : & \quad u(a, k, r_1, i_1) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_0, i_0)) \\ & \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge v_1 = 0 \wedge v_2 = 0 \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge \\ & \quad r_0 = v_1 + \text{select}(a, v_2) \wedge i_0 = v_2 + 1 \wedge i_0 < k \wedge 0 \leq i_0 < \text{size}(a) \wedge \\ & \quad i_1 = i_0 + 1 \wedge r_1 = r_0 + \text{select}(a, i_0)] \\ (K') : & \quad u(a, k, r_2, i_2) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_1, i_1)) \\ & \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge v_1 = 0 \wedge v_2 = 0 \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge \\ & \quad r_0 = v_1 + \text{select}(a, v_2) \wedge i_0 = v_2 + 1 \wedge 0 \leq i_0 \wedge i_1 < k \wedge \\ & \quad i_1 = i_0 + 1 \wedge r_1 = r_0 + \text{select}(a, i_0) \wedge i_2 = i_1 + 1 \wedge r_2 = r_1 + \text{select}(a, i_1)] \\ (L') : & \quad u(a, k, r_3, i_3) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_2, i_2)) \\ & \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge v_1 = 0 \wedge v_2 = 0 \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge \\ & \quad r_0 = v_1 + \text{select}(a, v_2) \wedge i_0 = v_2 + 1 \wedge 0 \leq i_0 \wedge i_2 < k \wedge \\ & \quad i_1 = i_0 + 1 \wedge r_1 = r_0 + \text{select}(a, i_0) \wedge i_2 = i_1 + 1 \wedge r_2 = r_1 + \text{select}(a, i_1) \wedge \\ & \quad i_3 = i_2 + 1 \wedge r_3 = r_2 + \text{select}(a, i_2)] \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, if we ignore the constraint, each of the divergent equations (J'), (K'), (L') is the same modulo renaming of variables, while the constraint grows. Essentially, we keep track of parts of the history of an equation in its constraint.

Backtracking to $(\{(J')\}, \{(B'^{-1}), (G'^{-1})\})$, we generalize (J') by dropping all clauses $v_i = q_i$, where v_i is an initialization variable and q_i a value. To make it explicit that these variables no longer play a special role, we rename them. Thus we generate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \quad u(a, k, r_1, i_1) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_0, i_0)) \\ & \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r_0 = x_1 + \text{select}(a, x_2) \\ & \quad \wedge i_0 = x_2 + 1 \wedge i_0 < k \wedge 0 \leq i_0 < \text{size}(a) \wedge i_1 = i_0 + 1 \wedge r_1 = r_0 + \text{select}(a, i_0)] \end{aligned}$$

Reformulating this to remove the variables which do not contribute anything to the equation (e.g. we can always choose $x_2 := i_0 - 1$ and $x_1 := \text{select}(a, x_2) - r_0$), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} (N') \quad & \quad u(a, k, r_1, i_1) \approx w(n, u(a, k', r_0, i_0)) \\ & \quad [k' = k-1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge 0 \leq i_0 < k \wedge \\ & \quad i_1 = i_0 + 1 \wedge r_1 = r_0 + \text{select}(a, i_0)] \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(N') \sim (N)$. We can now continue the proof process with $(\{(N')\}, \{(B'^{-1}), (G'^{-1})\})$, and complete much like we did in Example 4.13.

Formally, what we did is threefold. First, we alter the set of rules we work from.

Definition 5.2 (Initialization-free Rules). Let $\mathcal{V}_{\text{init}} \subset \mathcal{V}$ be a set of variables not occurring in the rules or in the initial equations. For any set of rules $\mathcal{R}$, its *initialization-free* counterpart $\mathcal{R}'$ is obtained from $\mathcal{R}$ by stepwise replacing any rule of the form $\ell \rightarrow C[f(r_1, \dots, r_i, \dots, r_n)] [\varphi]$ with $f \in \mathcal{D}$ and r_i a value by $\ell \rightarrow C[f(r_1, \dots, v, \dots, r_n)] [\varphi \wedge v = r_i]$, until no such rules remain. Here, v must be a fresh variable in $\mathcal{V}_{\text{init}}$.

Then, to apply GENERALIZATION to an equation $s \approx t [\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n]$ where the formulas φ_i are not conjunctions, we choose as the replacement equation:

$$s \approx t [\bigwedge \{\varphi_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n \wedge \varphi_i \text{ does not have the form } v = u \text{ with } v \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{init}} \text{ and } u \text{ a value}\}]$$

And subsequently rename all variables in $\mathcal{V}_{\text{init}}$ to variables in $\mathcal{V}$.

Finally, in order for this to approach to be successful, we restrict the SIMPLIFICATION and EXPANSION steps to preserve initialization constraints throughout the proof:

- In both SIMPLIFICATION and EXPANSION, *renamed* rules are considered. We assume these renamings respect membership of $\mathcal{V}_{\text{init}}$, so if x is renamed to y , then $y \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{init}}$ if and only if $x \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{init}}$. This keeps the initialization constraints in the required form.
- In $\sim$ steps, the variables in $\mathcal{V}_{\text{init}}$ are not renamed, and the constraints $v = n$ are ignored: to simplify the presentation of $s \approx t [\varphi \wedge v_1 = n_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k = n_k]$, we modify $s \approx t [\varphi]$, obtaining $s' \approx t' [\varphi']$, and continue with $s' \approx t' [\varphi \wedge v_1 = n_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k = n_k]$. This is to avoid for instance translating $f(v_i) [v_i = 0]$ back to $f(0) [\text{true}]$, which would defeat the point. We do allow the renaming of some v_i to a different v_j if $n_i = n_j$.

The exact strategy we use for simplifications and expansions in Ctrl—which includes an approach to handle the special variables—is described in Section 6.1.

5.2. Discussion

This method to obtain generalized equations is strong, but only for equations of a very specific form. Namely, we can only use the method if the equation part of the divergence has the same shape every time. This is the case for sum, because the rule that causes the divergence has the form $u(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow u(r_1, \dots, r_n) [\varphi]$, preserving its outer shape.

In general, the method is most likely to be successful for the analysis of tail-recursive functions (with accumulators), such as those obtained from procedural programs. We can also handle mutually recursive functions, like $u(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow w(r_1, \dots, r_m) [\varphi]$ and $w(y_1, \dots, y_m) \rightarrow u(q_1, \dots, q_n) [\psi]$. To analyze systems with general recursion, however, we will need different generalization or lemma generation techniques.

Note that `strlen` and `strcpy` also have the required tail-recursive form, and the generalization method works for them. However, here we additionally have to collect multiple clauses into a quantification before generalizing, as with equation (I') in Example 4.14.

6. IMPLEMENTATION

The method for program verification in this paper can be broken down into two parts:

- (1) transforming a procedural program into an LCTRS;
- (2) proving correctness properties on this LCTRS using rewriting induction.

An initial implementation of part 1, limited to functions on integers and one-dimensional statically allocated integer arrays is available at:

<http://www.trs.cm.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/c2lctrs/>

In future work, we hope to extend this implementation to include the remaining features discussed in Section 3 (and Appendix A) such as floating points, dynamic n -dimensional arrays, and more extensive error checking.

Part 2, the core method on LCTRSs, has been implemented in our tool Ctrl [Kop and Nishida 2015]. As prerequisites, we have also implemented basic techniques to automatically verify termination, confluence and quasi-reductivity. To handle constraints, the tool is coupled both with a small internal reasoner and the external SMT-solver Z3 [de Moura and Bjørner 2008]. An advantage of Z3 is that it is quite strong at *unsatisfiability* as well as satisfiability, which is essential to automatically test *validity*.

The internal reasoner has two functions:

- automatically detecting satisfiability or validity of simple statements quickly, without a call to an SMT-solver; this both gives a speedup, and allows us to optimize for often recurring questions (e.g. “find $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \{-2, \dots, 2\}$ such that φ is valid”, a satisfiability question needed to prove termination using *polynomial interpretations* [Lankford 1979]);
- simplifying the constraints of equations by for instance combining statements into quantifications; as this affects the shape of generalized equations, this significantly increases the power of the tool for functions like `strlen` and `strcpy`.

In addition, our notion of arrays is not supported by mainstream SMT-solvers, so we translate our array formulas into the SMT-LIB array-format; an array is encoded as a function from $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$, with an additional variable representing its size.

The latest version of Ctrl can be downloaded at:

<http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/software/ctrl/>

6.1. Strategy

Even assuming an oracle for determining satisfiability and validity of the constraints, it is not immediately clear how best to implement rewriting induction. There are many choices to be made during a derivation. Let us discuss the various decisions.

What inference rule to apply. Ctrl uses a simple strategy to select an inference rule: we simply select the first inference rule—or combination of inference rules—that applies on the current goal from the following list:

- (1) EQ-DELETION (if applicable) immediately followed by DELETION;
- (2) DISPROVE, but without the limitation to COMPLETE proof states;
- (3) CONSTRUCTOR;
- (4) SIMPLIFICATION;
- (5) a limited form of EXPANSION;
- (6) GENERALIZATION of all initialization variables $v_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{init}}$ at once;
- (7) the full form of EXPANSION.

Note that EQ-DELETION is not used on its own, and that EXPANSION is only ever applied on terms in normal form. This is a limitation; there are cases where this strategy does not suffice. However, the choice works well for most systems we tried. The completeness restriction on DISPROVE is dropped because the rule is used as part of the backtracking mechanism explained below. We will also say more about the choices made for SIMPLIFICATION (such as the rule and position to consider) and EXPANSION. POSTULATE is not implemented in the automatic system, as this would require the addition of lemma generation techniques, which requires further study.

Generalization and backtracking. The rule selection strategy is combined with a backtracking mechanism. Every proof state $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H})$ keeps track of all its ancestor states on which GENERALIZATION was applied. Whenever DISPROVE succeeds on a state with such ancestors (so necessarily an incomplete state), the prover backtracks to the most recent ancestor and continues without (immediately) generalizing. Typically, if a

GENERALIZATION is attempted too soon in the proof and results in an unsound equation, this unsoundness can be derived very quickly. This allows Ctrl to conclude failure of the GENERALIZATION step and move on to the remaining expansions.

Example 6.1. Following Example 4.13 and its update in Example 5.1, our strategy follows the same steps until the state $(\{(G')\}, \{(B'^{-1})\})$. Here, “restricted expansion” does not apply (as we will see in Example 6.3), so we generalize, obtaining:

$$w(n, u(a, k', x_1, x_2) \approx u(a, k, r_0, i_0) \\ [k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r_0 = x_1 + \text{select}(a, x_2) \wedge i_0 = x_2 + 1]$$

We consider $(\{(G')\}, \{(B'^{-1})\})$ as “open”. The only thing we can now do is EXPANSION (restricted or not). Expanding in the right-hand side gives three equations, including:

$$\text{return}(a, r_0) \approx w(n, u(a, k', x_1, x_2) \quad [i_0 \geq k \wedge \\ k' = k - 1 \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r_0 = x_1 + \text{select}(a, x_2) \wedge i_0 = x_2 + 1]$$

This equation is simplified to:

$$\text{return}(a, r_0) \approx \text{return}(a, n + x_1) \\ [x_2 \geq k' \wedge 0 \leq k' < \text{size}(a) \wedge n = \text{select}(a, k') \wedge r_0 = x_1 + \text{select}(a, x_2)]$$

By CONSTRUCTOR, we obtain $r_0 \approx n + x_1 [\varphi]$, where φ can be satisfied by for example the substitution $[k' := 0, x_1 := 0, x_2 := 1, a := [0; 1], n := 0, r_0 := 1]$; by DISPROVE, we obtain $\perp$. However, we are in an incomplete state, because there is a previous open proof state. Thus, we backtrack to $(\{(G')\}, \{(B'^{-1})\})$ and continue with full expansion.

The COMPLETENESS rule is implemented via the same mechanism: if $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H})$ has a most recent ancestor $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}')$ with $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{E}'$ (which holds when $|\mathcal{E}| < |\mathcal{E}'|$ for the first time, as Ctrl always considers the most recently added equations first), then $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{H}')$ is dropped from the list of ancestors. When the list is empty, we consider the state COMPLETE (provided the LCTRS is confluent). This approach allows Ctrl to backtrack to the ancestor that is most likely to be relevant to the current unsoundness.

Example 6.2. In Example 4.13, we might consider the proof state $(\{(K)\}, \dots)$ as “open” when generalizing (K) to (N) . Once equation (R) is removed, we are allowed to mark this state as “closed” because $\emptyset \subset \{(K)\}$ (although since the proof is complete at that point, it is not really necessary in this example).

Aside from backtracking due to DISPROVE steps, there is a second backtracking mechanism. This is because, although SIMPLIFICATION and EXPANSION prioritize choices (for positions and rules) most likely to result in success, sometimes the priority choice does not work out while the secondary one does. To test alternatives, Ctrl imposes an evaluation limit: when a path has taken more than N expansions, it is aborted, and the prover backtracks to a direct parent. Ctrl starts with a limit of $N = 2$, and then increases this limit if it does not result in a successful proof or disproof.

Simplification. For SIMPLIFICATION, there are three choices to be made: the position, the rule and how to instantiate fresh variables in that rule.

For the position, Ctrl simply selects the leftmost, innermost position where a rule matches. The choice for leftmost is arbitrary; we use innermost evaluation because it avoids a need to retry the same position repeatedly after its subterms change.

For the rule, all applicable rules are ordered in reverse chronological order; so the most recently added rule first. This prioritizes induction rules, and includes rules in $\mathcal{R}$ as final options. If using the favored rule leads to a divergence, the backtracking mechanism ensures that other rules are attempted next. However, if *all* rules lead to

divergence, and a rule in $\mathcal{R}$ applies, we consider the attempt a failure, and abort (backtracking to the parent state). This is done because, from testing with simple systems, allowing EXPANSION to be applied on terms not in $\mathcal{R}$ -normal form leads to an explosive number of states, which interferes with the effectiveness of the backtracking.

In some cases—in particular for induction rules—the right-hand side of the rule and/or the constraint contain variables which do not occur in the left-hand side. Examples are (N) in Example 4.13 and (J) in Example 4.14. Here, Ctrl attempts to instantiate as many variables in the rule by variables in the equation as possible. That is, to rewrite an equation $s \approx t [\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n]$ at the root of s with a rule $l \rightarrow r [\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_m]$, we first determine some γ such that $s = \ell\gamma$, and $\gamma(v_i) = v_i$ for all the special variables. Then, if any ψ_i has the form $C[x, y_1, \dots, y_k]$ with $x \in \text{Dom}(\gamma)$ and all $y_i \notin \text{Dom}(\gamma)$, and there is some $\psi_j = C\gamma[\gamma(x), s_1, \dots, s_k]$, then we extend γ with $[y_i := s_i]$ for all i . This process is finite, and corresponds to the choices for equation (Q) in Example 4.13 and (M'), (Z') in Examples 4.14 and 4.15. Other variables are simply chosen fresh.

Expansion. For EXPANSION, the most important question is not which *position* to expand at, but rather which *side* of the equation, as this determines the shape of the induction rule to be added. In addition, we may decide not to add an induction rule, even if doing so does not directly result in non-termination.

For this, we analyze *recursion*. For defined symbols f, g , let $f \rightsquigarrow g$ if there is a rule $f(\vec{\ell}) \rightarrow r [\varphi]$ with g a symbol in r . We denote $f \succsim g$ iff $f \rightsquigarrow^* g$, and $f \succ g$ iff $f \succsim g$ and $g \not\succsim f$. Then, we split symbols into five categories: *constructors*, *calculation symbols*, *non-recursive symbols*, *tail-recursive symbols* and *general recursive symbols*. Here, a symbol f is considered *recursive* if $f \rightsquigarrow^+ f$. A recursive symbol is *tail-recursive* if its only defining rules (in $\mathcal{R}$) have the form $f(\vec{\ell}) \rightarrow g(\vec{r}) [\varphi]$ with $f \succsim g$ and $f \succ h$ for all symbols h occurring in $\vec{r}$, or the form $f(\vec{\ell}) \rightarrow x [\varphi]$ with x a variable; recursive functions not of this form are *general recursive*.

We use this categorization to determine what side and position of the equation to expand on, whether an induction rule should be added, and whether an expansion should be done before GENERALIZATION (so as part of step (5) of the list) or afterwards.

For the latter two questions, expanding $s[f(\vec{u})]_p \simeq t [\varphi]$ at position p of s is considered “restricted” in three cases:

- f is a *general recursive* defined symbol, and the rule $s \rightarrow t [\varphi]$ can be added;
- f is a *tail-recursive* defined symbol, neither s nor t contains initialization variables v_i , and the rule $s \rightarrow t [\varphi]$ can be added;
- f is a *non-recursive defined* symbol; in this case no rule is added.

Here, aside from the termination requirement, we impose that a rule $f(\vec{\ell}) \rightarrow r [\varphi]$ cannot be added (and therefore the corresponding expansion is not considered *unrestricted*!) if f is a constructor or calculation symbol. This is done because, even if such a rule does not *immediately* give conflicts with the termination requirement for $\mathcal{H}$, admitting the rule is likely to give problems later on, preventing the addition of rules that might be more useful. For *unrestricted* expansion, $s[f(\vec{u})]_p \simeq t [\varphi]$ may be expanded at position p of s regardless of f , but no induction rule is added.

In particular, both in restricted and unrestricted expansion we do *not* add induction rules when expanding at a tail-recursive position, unless the initialization variables have already been generalized. There is no theoretical motivation for this; we do so because testing suggests that they are typically not useful. These are for example the rules (G⁻¹) and (J) in Example 4.13. This allows Ctrl to avoid many termination checks, which is a bottleneck in the process. For similar reasons, we do not add induction rules when expanding at a non-recursive position.

Example 6.3. Let us look closer at Example 4.13. The first expansion there occurs in the state $(\{(B')\}, \emptyset)$, and in the right-hand side of the equation. This is not an arbitrary choice: restricted expansion cannot be used with the tail-recursive symbol u , only the general recursive symbol sum4 .

Then, our strategy closely follows the given derivation until we reach the state $(\{(G')\}, \{(B'^{-1})\})$. Here restricted expansion is not possible, so we generalize instead, as we did in Example 6.1. After this, an expansion on the u symbol on either side is restricted, so we continue as we did in Example 6.1, eventually backtracking to the state $(\{(G')\}, \{(B'^{-1})\})$. Now we use *unrestricted* expansion, continuing with the proof state $(\{(H'), (I')\}, \{(B'^{-1})\})$ —so unlike the example, we do not add the induction rule (G'^{-1}) . As this rule is indeed not used later on, the choice does not cause large changes.

With regards to the position to expand at, we follow the same approach as for SIMPLIFICATION: we try all suitable positions (in a leftmost, innermost way), relying on the backtracking to attempt the later ones if the former are unsuccessful. Thus, for an equation $s \approx t \ [\varphi]$, we default to trying expansions in the left-hand side s first. However, in order to prioritize the more promising expansions, in the restricted setting of clause (5) we first attempt all expansions on a general recursive symbol, then those with a non-recursive defined symbol, and then those with a tail-recursive one. In the unrestricted setting, we simply follow the leftmost innermost strategy.

Testing shows that this method is very effective for the specific case of proving equivalence between a general recursive and a tail-recursive function (as required when proving equivalence between an iterative function and a recursive specification for C-programs). Its effect can be seen in Example 4.13: by introducing induction rules to eliminate the general recursive functions early on, we are more likely to arrive at a diverging sequence where all equations have the same outer shape; e.g. $(u(\vec{q}_i) \approx C[u(\vec{v}_i), u(\vec{w}_i)] \mid i \in \mathbb{N})$ where the context C remains unaltered. As observed in Section 5.2, this is ideal for our generalization method.

The final decision for EXPANSION is which of the new equations in $\text{Expd}(s, t, \varphi, p)$ we address first. Here, we have chosen to give priority to those equations whose symbols are smallest with respect to $\succ$. Thus, for example after expanding (B) in Example 4.13, we consider (C)—which has new symbols $\{\text{return}, 0\}$ —before (D)—with new symbols $\{w, \text{select}, -, 1\}$ —because $w \succ \text{return}, 0$. This is because “smaller” terms represent states closer to the end of a function, which allows DISPROVE to succeed faster, if the equation is not an inductive theorem. Due to this choice, we can typically abort unsuccessful branches (especially after a GENERALIZATION step) quite fast.

Constraint Modification. In the string examples of Section 4.5, we saw the importance of altering the constraint after simplifications and expansions. Ctrl also does this automatically. As the basis, when a clause ϕ_i in the constraint $\phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n$ is implied by the others—but ignoring any definition clauses $v_i = n$ —it may be removed. We also remove clauses for variables which do not play a role anymore (such as k in equation (R') in Example 4.15). Most importantly, Ctrl tries to introduce *ranged quantifications* $\forall x \in \{k_1, \dots, k_n\} [\varphi(x)]$ whenever possible, provided $n \geq 3$ (to lessen the effect of coincidence). We saw this done in Section 4.5. Formally, and without reference to a specific theory, we could describe our approach as follows:

if φ has clauses $C[a], C[b], C[c]$ for some context C and variables a, b, c , as well as $b = f(a)$ and $c = f(b)$, then we may replace the C -clauses by $\forall i \in \{0, \dots, 2\} [C[f^i(a)]]$

This formulation is more general than what we use; it would allow us to for instance replace $a[i] = 0 \wedge a[j] = 0 \wedge a[k] = 0 \wedge j = i + 2 \wedge k = j + 2$ by $\forall l \in \{0, \dots, 2\} [a[i + 2 \cdot l] = 0]$, writing $f = \lambda x. x + 2$. However, this kind of alteration cannot be done without understanding the relevant theory (to be able to write f^i in a suitable form). This is

why, at the moment, we only consider clauses where $b = a + 1$ and $c = b + 1$. Then we can simply replace the clauses by $\forall i \in \{a, \dots, c\} [C[i]]$. Since loop counters are typically implemented as integers, this still captures a large group of constraints.

Following $\forall$ -introduction, we consider the boundaries of the range (0 and 2 in the example). If one of them is a special variable v_i , we replace it by the value it is defined as, since it is typically better not to generalize the starting point of a quantification, only the ending point. Thus for instance $\forall j \in \{v_0, \dots, k\} [\text{select}(x, j) \neq 0] \wedge v_0 = 0 \wedge i = v_0 + 1 \wedge k = i + 1$ is replaced by $\forall j \in \{0, \dots, k\} [\text{select}(x, j) \neq 0] \wedge v_0 = 0 \wedge i = v_0 + 1 \wedge k = i + 1$.

Non-Confluence. It is worth observing that our strategy is somewhat unfair to non-confluent systems: a successful application of DISPROVE is treated as evidence of an unsound equation, but in a non-confluent system, this is not necessarily the case.

This is deliberate: from the interest of proving that two functions always produce the same result, non-confluent LCTRSs can be seen as inherently incorrect.¹⁵ Thus, we are primarily interested in systems which are either definitely confluent, or whose confluence cannot easily be confirmed. In the latter case, it is preferable to show non-equivalence (which is translated to a MAYBE in the output) over equivalence.

6.2. Experiments

To assess performance and precision of Ctrl empirically, we tested five assignments from a group of students in the first-year programming course in Nagoya:

- sum: given n , implement $\sum_{i=1}^n i$ (so not with arrays!);
- fib: calculate the first n Fibonacci numbers;
- sumfrom: given n and m , implement $\sum_{i=n}^m i$;
- strlen (following the specification in Example 4.14);
- strcpy (following the specification in Example 4.15);

We also tested our own implementations of arrsum (the array summation that was the leading Example 1.1 in this paper) and an implementation of the factorial function fact from Examples 2.2 and 3.3. All seven (groups of) programs were automatically translated into an LCTRS by our c2lctrs tool, and subsequently tested against a specification: for strlen and strcpy we used the same specification as in Section 4.5, for the others a translation of a recursive implementation of the function.¹⁶

The results are summarized to the right. The MAYBE cases in the table are both those where Ctrl failed to find a proof, took more than 60 seconds and (in one case) failed to prove termination of the initial system. The *time* field lists the average runtime excluding timeouts.

It is worth noting that both many of the NO and of the MAYBE answers are due to students failing to account for the boundary conditions; for example, several of the strlen and strcpy functions were incorrect when given an empty string as input, and

function	YES	NO	MAYBE	time
sum	9	0	4	2.4
fib	4	6	3	6.6
sumfrom	3	1	2	1.9
strlen	1	0	5	7.2
strcpy	3	0	3	11.5
arrsum	1	0	0	4.2
fact	1	0	0	2.4
total	22	7	17	5.9

¹⁵The non-confluent (LC)TRSs $\mathcal{R} = \{f \rightarrow a, f \rightarrow b, g \rightarrow a, g \rightarrow b\}$ along with the inductive theorem $f \approx g$ highlights that we only prove that two functions *can* produce the same result, not that they *always* do.

¹⁶However, honesty compels us to mention that in the case of fib, we used a manual translation because the one obtained from c2lctrs caused problems in the equivalence proof: where our manual translation has a rule $\text{fib}(x) \rightarrow w(\text{fib}(x - 1), \text{fib}(x - 2)) [x - 2 \geq 0]$, the automatic one splits the two recursive calls. This both causes a more sophisticated termination argument to be needed, and makes it significantly harder to eliminate the recursion in the inductive process. We hope to improve the inductive process for this sort of problem in the future, but we expect that an additional lemma generation technique will be needed.

in `fib` the students often failed to consider negative input. This leads to a NO, or to a MAYBE if the system is not confluent, i.e. when not all variables have been initialized.

To limit the impact of these errors on our benchmarks, we have done a second test, where we altered the specification to account for these mistakes. The results of this

function	YES	NO	MAYBE	time
sum	9	0	4	2.2
fib	10	1	2	5.9
sumfrom	3	0	3	2.3
strlen	2	0	4	6.0
strcpy	5	0	1	14.1
arrsum	1	0	0	4.2
fact	1	0	0	2.5
total	31	1	14	5.9

fairer test are summarized to the left.

Investigating the failures, we found that they could be split into two categories. First, the category where the function was wrong but Ctrl could not answer NO due to non-confluence. In the future, it would be worthwhile to extend the negative aspect of the prover, allowing also for negative answers in that setting (where NO is

then extended to mean “there is an instantiation of the equation where both sides *can* be evaluated to distinct normal forms”).

The second group of failures is more interesting, as it illustrates a weakness of our method: in some cases, generalizing removes a relation between two variables. This happens for instance when x and y are both initialized to 0, and subsequently increased by 1 in every loop iteration; after generalizing, it is no longer evident that they are the same. This suggests a natural direction for improvement to the technique.

An evaluation page, including exact problem statements, is given at:

<http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/software/ctrl/tocl/>

7. RELATED WORK

The related work can be split into two categories. First, the literature on rewriting induction; and second, the work on program verification and equivalence analysis.

7.1. Rewriting Induction

The inductive theorem proving method in this paper is not new; building on a long literature about rewriting induction (see e.g. [Bouhoula 1997; Falke and Kapur 2012; Reddy 1990; Sakata et al. 2009]), the core method should mostly be seen as an adaptation of existing techniques to the LCTRS formalism introduced in [Kop and Nishida 2013], which therefore generalizes the possibilities of earlier work.

The most relevant related works are [Falke and Kapur 2012; Sakata et al. 2009], where rewriting induction is defined for different styles of constrained rewriting. In both cases, the formalisms used are restricted to *integer* functions and predicates; it is not clear how they can be generalized to handle more advanced theories. LCTRSs offer a more general setting, which allows us to use rewriting induction also for systems with for instance arrays, bitvectors or real numbers. Additionally, by not restricting the predicates in Σ_{theory} , we can handle (a limited form of) quantifiers in constraints.

To enable these advantages, we had to make subtle changes to the inference rules, in particular SIMPLIFICATION and EXPANSION. Our changes make it possible to modify constraints of an equation, and to handle *irregular* rules, where the constraint introduces fresh variables. This has the additional advantage that it enables EXPANSION steps when this would create otherwise infeasible rules.

Furthermore, the method requires a very different implementation from previous definitions: we need separate strategies to simplify constraints (e.g. deriving quantified statements), and, in order to support the desired generality, must rely primarily on external solvers to manipulate constraints.

In addition to the adaptation of rewriting induction, we have introduced a completely new lemma generalization technique, which offers a powerful tool for analyz-

ing loops in particular. A similar idea (abstracting the initialization values) is used in [Nakabayashi et al. 2010], but the execution is very different. In [Nakabayashi et al. 2010], an equation $s \approx t [\varphi]$ is generalized by first adapting $s \approx t$ using templates obtained from the rules, then by generalizing φ using a set of relations between positions, which the proof process keeps track of. In our method, the constraint carries all the information. Our method succeeds on all examples in [Nakabayashi et al. 2010], and on some where [Nakabayashi et al. 2010] fails (cf. Appendix C).

For *unconstrained* systems, there are several generalization methods in the literature, e.g., [Kapur and Sakhanenko 2003; Kapur and Subramaniam 1996; Urso and Kounalis 2004]. Mostly, these approaches are very different from our method. Most similar, perhaps, is [Kapur and Sakhanenko 2003], which also proposes a method to generalize initial values. As observed by Nakabayashi et al. [2010], this method is not sufficient to handle even our simplest benchmarks `sum` and `fact`, as the argument for the loop variable cannot be generalized; in contrast, our method has no problem with such variables.

As far as we are aware, there is no other work for lemma generation of rewrite systems (or functional programs) obtained from procedural programs.

Like us, Giesl et al. [2007] also consider the verification of procedural programs via a transformation to a functional program with tail recursion, followed by an invocation of an inductive theorem prover (albeit in an unconstrained setting). They propose an equivalence-preserving program transformation to a general recursive program which eliminates accumulator arguments in the functional program. One could imagine a combination of their approach with ours, which may be beneficial e.g. for programs with nested loops.

7.2. Automatic Program Verification

Our intended goal is to (automatically) verify correctness properties of procedural programs. As mentioned in the introduction, however, most existing verifiers require human interaction. Exceptions are the fully automated tools in the *Competition on Software Verification* (SV-COMP, <http://sv-comp.sosy-lab.org/>), which verify program properties like unreachability, termination and memory safety.

However, comparing our approach to these tools does not seem useful. While we can, to some extent, tackle termination and memory safety, the main topic of this paper is *equivalence*, which is not studied in SV-COMP. Technically equivalence problems can be formulated as reachability queries (e.g., $f(x) \approx g(x) [c]$ is handled by the main function to the right). However, none of the participating tools in the “recursive” category of SV-COMP 2015¹⁷ was able to prove equivalence for our simplest (integer) example `sum`.¹⁸ We conjecture that the tools did not find a *tight* invariant for the loops, which would be needed for an equivalence proof.

```
int main() {
    int x =
        __VERIFIER_nondet_int();
    if (c && f(x) != g(x)) {
        ERROR: goto ERROR;
    }
    return 0;
}
```

For the motivating application from the introduction, automated grading, program verification techniques like bounded model checking have also been proposed

¹⁷See also: <http://sv-comp.sosy-lab.org/2015/results/>

¹⁸Beagle 1.1 and the SV-COMP 2015 version of SeaHorn quickly reported unknown results, the web interface of Ultimate Automizer timed out, the web interface of Ultimate Kojak failed with an error message, CPArec did not respond within a few minutes, and CPAchecker did not report a proof either. We did not test the bounded verification tools Smack and CBMC since for examples with an a priori unbounded number of loop iterations or recursion depth they can only disprove, but not prove safety or equivalence.

The C file in SV-COMP format is available at: <http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/software/ctrl/tocl/>

[Vujosevic-Janicic et al. 2013]. While this can provide a significant improvement over classic approaches to testing, there is still a non-zero risk of missing bugs due to under-approximation. Thus, it could be beneficial to add our approach to the portfolio as well.

Apart from ours, there are also other works dedicated to proving equivalence of two programs. For instance, Lopes and Monteiro [2015] propose a technique for programs using integers and undefined function symbols (as an abstraction of deterministic complex function), which uses self-composition, a safety-preserving transformation of undefined functions to polynomials, recurrence solving for loops, and finally a standard software model checker. The self-composition and the invocation of a software model checker corresponds to the approach to using tools from SV-COMP for proving equivalence that we sketched above. In contrast to our approach, the approach by Lopes and Monteiro [2015] does not support *mutable* arrays, whose content can be changed during the program's execution as a side effect.

8. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

This paper is by no means intended as the end station for inductive theorem proving on LCTRS, but rather as the beginning. The given generalization method is powerful, but does not suffice for more complicated systems or equations. A single method simply cannot bypass the need to search for loop invariants altogether.

Instead, a natural extension would be both to adapt existing lemma generation techniques to the constrained setting, and to adapt techniques for finding loop invariants towards the setting of rewriting induction, for instance as a way to suggest suitable lemmas. Aside from lemma generation techniques, it might also be worthwhile to directly look at the constraints, and develop advanced methods for constraint modification, which could be followed by a generalization step.

Furthermore, we may extend the translation from procedural programs. Inspired by Otto et al. [2010], a direction for future work is to allow for composite data structures in the form of structs in the procedural program and to translate them to corresponding term data structures. This would target the case of tree-shaped data structures, which can faithfully be represented via terms. In addition, there is nothing special about C: the same ideas could be used for other imperative languages such as Python or Java. Thus, we might also use the technique to show equivalence between functions in different languages. This could be particularly interesting for a reference implementation in an inherently memory-safe language like F# or Java, and an efficient implementation in a language like C that does not come with memory safety guarantees.

Finally, we hope to extend the implementation in the future, both to increase the strength of the inductive theorem proving—adding new theory and testing for more sophisticated heuristics—and to add more features to the translation from C-code.

9. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have done two things. First, we have discussed a transformation from procedural programs to constrained term rewriting. By abstracting from the memory model underlying a particular programming language, and instead encoding concepts like integers and arrays in an intuitive way, this transformation can be applied to various different (imperative) programming languages. The resulting LCTRS is close to the original program, and has in-built error checking for all mistakes of interest.

Second, we have extended rewriting induction to the setting of LCTRSs. We have shown how this method can be used to prove correctness of procedural programs. The LCTRS formalism is a good analysis backend for this, since the techniques from standard rewriting can typically be extended to it, and native support for logical constraints and data types like integers and arrays is present.

We have also introduced a new technique to generalize equations. The idea of this method is to identify constants used as *variable initializations*, keep track of them during the proof process, and abstract from these constants when a proof attempt diverges. The LCTRS setting is instrumental in the simplicity of this method, as it boils down to dropping a (cleverly chosen) part of a constraint.

In addition to the theory of these techniques, we provide an implementation of both parts. Initial results on a small database of student programs are very promising. In future work, we will aim to increase the strength of both implementations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Stephan Falke, who contributed to an older version of this work, and for the helpful remarks of the reviewers for [Kop and Nishida 2014].

References

- Elvira Albert, Puri Arenas, Samir Genaim, Germán Puebla, and Damiano Zanardini. 2008. Removing useless variables in cost analysis of Java bytecode. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*. ACM, Fortaleza, 368–375.
- Christophe Alias and Denis Barthou. 2003. Algorithm Recognition based on Demand-Driven Data-flow Analysis. In *10th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering, WCRE 2003, Victoria, Canada, November 13-16, 2003*. IEEE Computer Society, Victoria, 296–305.
- María Alpuente, Santiago Escobar, and Salvador Lucas. 2007. Removing redundant arguments automatically. *TPLP* 7, 1-2 (2007), 3–35.
- David A. Basin and Toby Walsh. 1992. Difference Matching. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Automated Deduction (LNCS)*, Vol. 607. Springer, Saratoga Springs, NY, USA, 295–309.
- Dirk Beyer, Alessandro Cimatti, Alberto Griggio, M. Erkan Keremoglu, and Roberto Sebastiani. 2009. Software model checking via large-block encoding. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design*. IEEE, Austin, 25–32.
- Adel Bouhoula. 1997. Automated Theorem Proving by Test Set Induction. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 23, 1 (1997), 47–77.
- Adel Bouhoula and Florent Jacquemard. 2008a. *Automated Induction for Complex Data Structures*. Technical Report. CoRR. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0811.4720>.
- Adel Bouhoula and Florent Jacquemard. 2008b. Automated Induction with Constrained Tree Automata. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Joint Conference on Automated Reasoning (LNAI)*, Vol. 5195. Springer, Sydney, 539–554.
- Martin Brain, Cesare Tinelli, Philipp Ruemmer, and Thomas Wahl. 2015. An Automatable Formal Semantics for IEEE-754 Floating-Point Arithmetic. (2015). Technical report, available at <http://smt-lib.org/papers/BTRW15.pdf>.
- Marc Brockschmidt, Byron Cook, and Carsten Fuhs. 2013. Better termination proving through cooperation. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (LNCS)*, Vol. 8044. Springer, St. Petersburg, 413–429.
- Alan Bundy. 2001. The Automation of Proof by Mathematical Induction. In *Handbook of Automated Reasoning*. Elsevier, North Holland, 845–911.
- Alan Bundy, David Basin, Dieter Hutter, and Andrew Ireland. 2005. *Rippling: Meta-Level Guidance for Mathematical Reasoning*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Alan Bundy, Andrew Stevens, Frank van Harmelen, Andrew Ireland, and Alan Smaill. 1993. Rippling: a heuristic for guiding inductive proofs. *Artificial Intelligence* 62, 2 (1993), 185–253.
- Cristiano Calcagno, Dino Distefano, Jérémy Dubreil, Dominik Gabi, Pieter Hooimeijer, Martino Luca, Peter W. O’Hearn, Irene Papakonstantinou, Jim Purbrick, and Dulma Rodriguez. 2015. Moving Fast with Software Verification. In *Proceedings of the 7th International NASA Formal Methods Symposium (LNCS)*, Vol. 9058. Springer, Pasadena, 3–11.
- Byron Cook, Heidy Khlaaf, and Nir Piterman. 2015. On Automation of CTL* Verification for Infinite-State Systems. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (Part I) (LNCS)*, Vol. 9206. Springer, San Francisco, 13–29.
- Leonardo de Moura and Nikolaj Bjørner. 2008. Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (LNCS)*, Vol. 4963. Springer, Budapest, 337–340.

- Stephan Falke. 2009. *Term Rewriting with Built-In Numbers and Collection Data Structures*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA.
- Stephan Falke and Deepak Kapur. 2009. A Term Rewriting Approach to the Automated Termination Analysis of Imperative Programs. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Automated Deduction (LNAI)*, Vol. 5663. Springer, Montreal, 277–293.
- Stephan Falke and Deepak Kapur. 2012. Rewriting Induction + Linear Arithmetic = Decision Procedure. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Joint Conference on Automated Reasoning (LNAI)*, Vol. 7364. Springer, Manchester, 241–255.
- Stephan Falke, Deepak Kapur, and Carsten Sinz. 2011. Termination Analysis of C Programs Using Compiler Intermediate Languages. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications (LIPICs)*, Vol. 10. Dagstuhl, Novi Sad, 41–50.
- Yuki Furuichi, Naoki Nishida, Masahiko Sakai, Keiichiro Kusakari, and Toshiki Sakabe. 2008. Approach to Procedural-program Verification Based on Implicit Induction of Constrained Term Rewriting Systems. *IPSJ Transactions on Programming* 1, 2 (2008), 100–121. In Japanese; a translated summary is available at <http://www.trs.cm.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/crisys/>.
- Jürgen Giesl, Armin Kühnemann, and Janis Voigtländer. 2007. Deaccumulation techniques for improving provability. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.* 71, 2 (2007), 79–113.
- Benny Godlin and Ofer Strichman. 2009. Regression verification. In *Proceedings of the 46th Design Automation Conference*. ACM, San Francisco, 466–471.
- Gérard P. Huet and Jean-Marie Hullot. 1982. Proofs by Induction in Equational Theories with Constructors. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 25, 2 (1982), 239–266.
- Michael Huth and Mark Ryan. 2000. *Logic in Computer Science: Modelling and Reasoning about Systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Deepak Kapur and Nikita A. Sakhanenko. 2003. Automatic Generation of Generalization Lemmas for Proving Properties of Tail-Recursive Definitions. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics (LNCS)*, Vol. 2758. Springer, Rome, 136–154.
- Deepak Kapur and Mahadevan Subramaniam. 1996. Lemma Discovery in Automated Induction. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Automated Deduction (LNCS)*, Vol. 1104. Springer, New Brunswick, 538–552.
- Hiroataka Koike and Yoshihito Toyama. 2000. Comparison between Inductionless Induction and Rewriting Induction. *Comp. Soft.* 17, 6 (2000), 1–12. In Japanese.
- Cynthia Kop. 2013. Termination of LCTRSs. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Termination*. Bertinoro, 59–63.
- Cynthia Kop and Naoki Nishida. 2013. Term Rewriting with Logical Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Frontiers of Combining Systems (LNAI)*, Vol. 8152. Springer, Nancy, 343–358.
- Cynthia Kop and Naoki Nishida. 2014. Automatic Constrained Rewriting Induction Towards Verifying Procedural Programs. In *Proceedings of the 12th Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems (LNCS)*, Vol. 8858. Springer, Singapore, 334–353.
- Cynthia Kop and Naoki Nishida. 2015. ConsTrained Rewriting tool. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning (LNCS)*, Vol. 9450. Springer, Suva, 549–557.
- Sudipta Kundu, Zachary Tatlock, and Sorin Lerner. 2009. Proving optimizations correct using parameterized program equivalence. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM, Dublin, 327–337.
- Shuvendu K. Lahiri, Chris Hawblitzel, Ming Kawaguchi, and Henrique Rebêlo. 2012. SYMDIFF: A Language-Agnostic Semantic Diff Tool for Imperative Programs. In *24th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (LNCS)*, Vol. 7358. Springer, Berkeley, 712–717.
- Dallas Lankford. 1979. *On Proving Term Rewriting Systems are Noetherian*. Technical Report MTP-3. Louisiana Technical University, Ruston, LA, USA.
- Nuno P. Lopes and José Monteiro. 2015. Automatic Equivalence Checking of Programs with Uninterpreted Functions and Integer Arithmetic. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* (2015). To appear.
- John McCarthy. 1960. Recursive Functions of Symbolic Expressions and Their Computation by Machine, Part I. *Commun. ACM* 3, 4 (1960), 184–195.
- Naoki Nakabayashi, Naoki Nishida, Keiichiro Kusakari, Toshiki Sakabe, and Masahiko Sakai. 2010. Lemma Generation Method in Rewriting Induction for Constrained Term Rewriting Systems. *Computer Soft-*

- ware 28, 1 (2010), 173–189. In Japanese; translation available at <http://www.trs.cm.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/crisys/>.
- George C. Necula. 2000. Translation validation for an optimizing compiler. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM, Vancouver, 83–94.
- Robert Nieuwenhuis, Albert Oliveras, and Cesare Tinelli. 2006. Solving SAT and SAT Modulo Theories: From an abstract Davis–Putnam–Logemann–Loveland procedure to DPLL(T). *J. ACM* 53, 6 (2006), 937–977.
- Carsten Otto, Marc Brockschmidt, Christan von Essen, and Jürgen Giesl. 2010. Automated termination analysis of Java Bytecode by Term rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications (LIPICs)*, Vol. 6. Dagstuhl, Edinburgh, 259–276.
- Amir Pnueli, Michael Siegel, and Eli Singerman. 1998. Translation Validation. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for Construction and Analysis of Systems (LNCS)*, Bernhard Steffen (Ed.), Vol. 1384. Springer, Lisbon, 151–166.
- Uday S. Reddy. 1990. Term Rewriting Induction. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Automated Deduction (LNCS)*, Vol. 449. Springer, Kaiserslautern, 162–177.
- Tsubasa Sakata, Naoki Nishida, and Toshiki Sakabe. 2011. On Proving Termination of Constrained Term Rewrite Systems by Eliminating Edges from Dependency Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Workshop on Functional and Constraint Logic Programming (LNCS)*, Vol. 6816. Springer, Odense, 138–155.
- Tsubasa Sakata, Naoki Nishida, Toshiki Sakabe, Masahiko Sakai, and Keiichiro Kusakari. 2009. Rewriting induction for constrained term rewriting systems. *IPSJ Transactions on Programming* 2, 2 (2009), 80–96. In Japanese; a translated summary is available at <http://www.trs.cm.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/crisys/>.
- Fausto Spoto, Lunjin Lu, and Fred Mesnard. 2009. Using CLP Simplifications to Improve Java Bytecode Termination Analysis. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 253, 5 (2009), 129–144.
- Tachio Terauchi and Alexander Aiken. 2005. Secure Information Flow as a Safety Problem. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on Static Analysis (LNCS)*, Vol. 3672. Springer, London, 352–367.
- Pascal Urso and Emmanuel Kounalis. 2004. Sound generalizations in mathematical induction. *TCS* 323, 1-3 (2004), 443–471.
- Milena Vujosevic-Janicic, Mladen Nikolic, Dusan Tomic, and Viktor Kuncak. 2013. Software verification and graph similarity for automated evaluation of students’ assignments. *Information & Software Technology* 55, 6 (2013), 1004–1016.
- Toby Walsh. 1996. A Divergence Critic for Inductive Proof. *JAIR* 4 (1996), 209–235.

A. TRANSLATING C PROGRAMS WITH EXPLICIT POINTERS

As observed at the end of Section 3.6, the simple translation explored there has both up- and downsides. On the one hand, by abstracting from the memory model, we can simplify analysis. On the other, there are certain programs we cannot handle.

To simulate C programs with dynamically allocated arrays and/or explicit pointer use, we consider the memory model imposed by the C-standard. Declaring or allocating an array selects an amount of currently unused space in memory and designates it for use by the given array. It is *not* guaranteed that the allocated space is at a given position in memory relative to existing declarations; when an array is indexed out of its declared bounds, the resulting behavior is undefined—so this can safely be considered an error.¹⁹

We will think of a program's memory as a set of *blocks*, each block corresponding to a sequence of values. A pointer then becomes a location in such a block. In an LCTRS we will model this using a “memory” variable, which lists the various blocks as a sequence of arrays; a pointer is a pair of integers, selecting a memory block and its offset.

Limiting interest to programs on (dynamically allocated) integer or char arrays, we will use a memory variable of sort $\text{array}(\text{array}(\text{int}))$, which represents a sequence of integer arrays (i.e. $(\mathbb{N}^*)^*$); the default value $0_{\text{array}(\text{int})}$ is the empty sequence $\langle \rangle \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We use a theory signature with the array symbols introduced in Section 3.6, along with:

- $\text{allocate} : [\text{array}(\text{array}(\text{int})) \times \text{array}(\text{int})] \Rightarrow \text{array}(\text{array}(\text{int}))$, where $\mathcal{J}_{\text{allocate}}(\langle a_0, \dots, a_k \rangle, b) = \langle a_0, \dots, a_k, b \rangle$; that is, $\text{allocate}(\text{mem}, \text{arr})$ adds the new sequence arr to the memory;
- $\text{free} : [\text{array}(\text{array}(\text{int})) \times \text{int}] \Rightarrow \text{array}(\text{array}(\text{int}))$, where $\mathcal{J}_{\text{free}}(\langle a_0, \dots, a_k \rangle, n) = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, \langle \rangle, a_{n+1}, \dots, a_k \rangle$ if $0 \leq n \leq k$ and $\langle a_0, \dots, a_k \rangle$ otherwise; that is, the memory block indexed by n is considered empty, and any further attempt to address a location in that memory block should be considered an error.

A pointer is represented by a pair (b, o) of a block index and an offset within that block. The NULL-pointer is represented by $(-1, 0)$.

Example A.1. Consider the following example C++ function:

```
int *create(int k) {
  int *a = new int[k];
  int *b = a + 1;
  for (int i = 0; i < k; i += 2) b[i] = 42;
  return a;
}
```

Now, a and b share memory, and new memory is allocated. We might encode this as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{create}(\text{mem}, k) &\rightarrow \text{u}(\text{allocate}(\text{mem}, x), k, \text{size}(\text{mem}), 0) && [\text{size}(x) = k] \\
\text{u}(\text{mem}, k, ai, ao) &\rightarrow \text{v}(\text{mem}, k, ai, ao, ai, ao + 1, 0) \\
\text{v}(\text{mem}, k, ai, ao, bi, bo, i) &\rightarrow \text{w}(\text{mem}, k, ai, ao, bi, bo, i) && [i < k] \\
\text{v}(\text{mem}, k, ai, ao, bi, bo, i) &\rightarrow \text{return}(\text{mem}, ai, ao) && [i \geq k] \\
\text{w}(\text{mem}, k, ai, ao, bi, bo, i) &\rightarrow \text{error} && [bo + i < 0 \vee bo + i \geq \text{size}(\text{select}(\text{mem}, bi))] \\
\text{w}(\text{mem}, k, ai, ao, bi, bo, i) &\rightarrow \text{v}(\text{store}(\text{mem}, bi, \text{store}(\text{select}(\text{mem}, bi), bo + i, 42)), k, && \\
&\quad ai, ao, bi, bo, i + 2) && [0 \leq bo + i < \text{size}(\text{select}(\text{mem}, bi))]
\end{aligned}$$

(For clarity, we omit the simplification step that combines the first two rules, and the one that combines the third with the last two.)

Consider how this example is executed, starting from empty memory.

¹⁹See paragraph 6.5.6.9 in: <http://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg14/www/docs/n1570.pdf>

- (1) We call $\text{create}(\langle \rangle, 2)$, representing a function call when no arrays have been allocated.
- (2) By the first rule, we reduce to $u(\text{allocate}(\langle \rangle, x), 2, 0, 0)$, where x is a *random* array. The only thing we know is that it has size 2—this rule uses irregularity to represent the randomness potentially involved in an allocation. Thus, let us assume the sequence $[-4, 9]$ is chosen. Using a calculation step to evaluate the allocate, we obtain $u(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle, 2, 0, 0)$. Here, the pair $(0, 0)$ represents the array a : the first block in memory, read from the start (offset 0).
- (3) Then by the second rule (and a calculation), we reduce to $v(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle, 2, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$. The new pair $(0, 1)$ represents b : the same memory block as a , but with offset 1. This location points to the sequence $[9]$. The final 0 is the index for the loop counter i .
- (4) Entering the loop (as indeed $0 < 2$), we reduce to $w(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle, 2, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$.
- (5) Here, we do an array store: $b[i] = 42$; . The LCTRS first tests whether $b[i]$ corresponds to a position in allocated memory, and reduces to an error state if not. This is done by selecting the corresponding block from *mem*, then testing whether the offset for b and i together exceed the block's bounds. We succeed, as $0 \leq 0 + 1 < \text{size}(\text{select}(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle)) \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq 1 < \text{size}([-4, 9]) \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq 1 < 2$.
- (6) Thus, the update is done: we reduce to:

$$\begin{aligned} & v(\text{store}(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle, 0, \text{store}(\text{select}(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle), 1 + 0, 42)), 2, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0 + 2) \\ & \rightarrow_{\text{calc}}^* v(\text{store}(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle, 0, \text{store}([-4, 9]), 1, 42)), 2, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2) \\ & \rightarrow_{\text{calc}}^* v(\text{store}(\langle [-4, 9] \rangle, 0, [-4, 42]), 2, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2) \\ & \rightarrow_{\text{calc}} v(\langle [-4, 42] \rangle, 2, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2) \end{aligned}$$
 That is, we retrieve the space for b from memory (obtaining the full block $[-4, 9]$), update the position corresponding to $b[0]$ (which is the same as $a[1]$), obtaining $[-4, 42]$, and store the result into the corresponding position in memory. Then we carry on with $i + 2$.
- (7) Since $2 \geq 2$, we reduce to $\text{return}(\langle [-4, 42] \rangle, 0, 0)$, returning the dynamic array $[-4, 42]$.

Note that in step 5, we do not test whether b corresponds to currently allocated memory. This is safe because, if b is the NULL-pointer or corresponds to previously freed memory, then $\text{select}(\text{mem}, bi)$ is $\langle \rangle$, and any indexing in this array will cause an error regardless. Note also that this function gives a non-error result only for *even* k .

While Example A.1 considers only integer arrays, we could also handle programs with dynamically allocated arrays of varying types. In this case, we would simply use *multiple* memory variables with different type declarations.

B. SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR QUASI-REDUCTIVITY

In Section 4.1 we imposed the restriction to quasi-reductivity. Here, we will see a natural, syntactic approach to confirm this property.

Definition B.1 (Quasi-reductivity). An LCTRS $(\Sigma_{\text{terms}}, \Sigma_{\text{theory}}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{R})$ is quasi-reductive if for all $s \in \text{Terms}(\Sigma, \emptyset)$ one of the following holds:

- $s \in \text{Terms}(\text{Cons}, \emptyset)$ (we say: s is a *ground constructor term*);
- there is a t such that $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t$ (we say: s *reduces*).

Note the use of $\emptyset$ in this definition: we only consider *ground* terms, so a term $f(x)$ with $f \in \mathcal{D}$ is not required to reduce.

As observed in Footnote 9, this is equivalent to a more common definition:

LEMMA B.2. *An LCTRS is quasi-reductive if and only if all terms $f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ with f a defined or calculation symbol and all $s_i \in \text{Terms}(\text{Cons}, \emptyset)$, reduce.*

PROOF. If the LCTRS is quasi-reductive, then each such $f(\vec{s})$ reduces, as it is not a constructor term. If the LCTRS is not quasi-reductive, then let $f(\vec{s})$ be a minimal

ground irreducible non-constructor term. By minimality, all s_i must be constructor terms. If f is a constructor, then the whole term is a constructor term, contradiction, so f is either a defined symbol or a calculation symbol. $\square$

Now, to prove quasi-reductivity, we will impose the following restrictions:

Definition B.3 (Restrictions). An LCTRS $(\Sigma_{terms}, \Sigma_{theory}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{R})$ is:

- *left-linear* if for all rules $\ell \rightarrow r \ [\varphi] \in \mathcal{R}$: every variable in ℓ occurs only once;
- *constructor-sound* if there are ground constructor terms for every sort ι such that some $f : [\dots \times \iota \times \dots] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \mathcal{D}$ (so for every input sort of a defined symbol);
- *left-value-free* if the left-hand sides of rules do not contain any values.

Note that any LCTRS can be turned into a left-value-free one, by replacing a value v by a fresh variable and adding a constraint $x = v$ instead. Constructor-soundness seems quite natural, with a sort representing the set of ground constructor terms of that sort. Left-linearity is probably the greatest limitation; however, note that non-left-linear systems impose *syntactic* equality. In a rule

$$\text{addtoSet}(x, \text{setof}(x, \text{rest})) \rightarrow \text{setof}(x, \text{rest})$$

we can reduce $\text{addtoSet}(3 + 4, \text{setof}(3 + 4, s))$ immediately to $\text{setof}(3 + 4, s)$. However, we cannot reduce $\text{addtoSet}(3 + 4, \text{setof}(4 + 3, s))$ with this rule. There is also no syntactic way to check for *inequality*. Therefore, it seems like we could better formulate this rule and its complement using constraints, or (if the sort of x has non-value constructors) by a structural check. The rule above and its complement could for instance become:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{addtoSet}(x, \text{setof}(y, \text{rest})) \rightarrow \text{setof}(y, \text{rest}) & [x = y] \\ \text{addtoSet}(x, \text{setof}(y, \text{rest})) \rightarrow \text{setof}(y, \text{addtoSet}(x, \text{rest})) & [x \neq y] \end{array}$$

In this light, left-linearity also seems like a very natural restriction.

Comment: In [Falke and Kapur 2012] a similar method is introduced to prove quasi-reductivity of a different style of constrained rewriting. There, however, the systems are additionally restricted to be *value-safe*: the only constructors of sorts occurring in Σ_{theory} are values. Although our current examples all satisfy this requirement, we drop it here, because it is not necessary in the definition of LCTRSs.

THEOREM B.4. *A constructor-sound LCTRS with rules $\mathcal{R}$ is quasi-reductive if and only if the following conditions both hold:*

- *the same LCTRS restricted to constructor-rules $\mathcal{R}' := \{f(\vec{\ell}) \rightarrow r \ [\varphi] \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall i [\ell_i \in \text{Terms}(\text{Cons}, \mathcal{V})]\}$ is quasi-reductive;*
- *all constructor symbols with respect to $\mathcal{R}'$ are also constructors w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}$.*

PROOF. Suppose $\mathcal{R}'$ is quasi-reductive, and constructor terms are the same in either LCTRS. Then also $\mathcal{R}$ is quasi-reductive, as anything which reduces under $\mathcal{R}'$ also reduces under $\mathcal{R}$. Alternatively, suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is quasi-reductive.

Towards a contradiction, suppose $\mathcal{R}'$ has constructor symbols which are not constructors in $\mathcal{R}$; let f be such a symbol. As f is a constructor for $\mathcal{R}'$, there are no rules $f(\vec{\ell}) \rightarrow r \ [\varphi] \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$ which match terms of the form $f(\vec{s})$ with all $s_i \in \text{Terms}(\text{Cons}, \emptyset)$. Because f is a defined symbol, such terms exist by constructor-soundness. As nothing matches $f(\vec{s})$ itself, and its strict subterms are constructor terms so cannot be reduced, this term contradicts quasi-reductivity of $\mathcal{R}$!

For the first point, suppose towards a contradiction that $\mathcal{R}'$ is not quasi-reductive, yet $\mathcal{R}$ is, and the same terms are constructor terms in either. By Lemma B.2 there is

some irreducible $f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ with all s_i constructor terms and f not a constructor. As the s_i are constructor terms, the rules in $\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}'$ also cannot match! Thus, the term is also irreducible with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, contradiction. $\square$

Thus, in the following algorithm we limit interest to *constructor TRSs*, where the immediate arguments in the left-hand sides of rules are all constructor terms.

Main Algorithm. We assume given sequences $\iota_1, \dots, \iota_n$ of theory sorts, $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_m$ of sorts, and $x_1, \dots, x_n$ of variables, with each $x_i : \iota_i \in \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, we assume given a set A of pairs $(\vec{s}, \varphi)$. Here, $\vec{s}$ is a sequence $s_1, \dots, s_m$ of constructor terms which do not contain values, such that $\vdash s_i : \kappa_i$, and φ is a logical constraint. The s_i have no overlapping variables with each other or the x_j ; that is, a term $f(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_m)$ would be linear. Variables in $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{s}$ may occur in φ , however.

Now, for $b \in \{\text{term, value, either}\}$,²⁰ define the function $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A, b)$ as follows; this construction is well-defined by induction first on the number of function symbols occurring in A , second by the number of variables occurring in A , and third by the flag b (with either $>$ term, value). Only symbols in the terms s_i are counted for the first induction hypothesis, so not those in the constraints.

- if $m = 0$: let $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\} = (\bigcup_{(\varphi) \in A} \text{Var}(\varphi)) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$;
- if $\exists y_1 \dots y_k. \bigvee_{(\varphi) \in A} \varphi$ is valid, then **true**
- else **false**

Note that if $A = \emptyset$, this returns **false**.

- if $m > 0$ and $b = \text{either}$, then consider κ_1 . If κ_1 does not occur in Σ_{theory} , the result is:

$$\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A, \text{term})$$

If κ_1 occurs in Σ_{theory} and all constructors with output sort κ_1 are values, then the result is:

$$\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A, \text{value})$$

If κ_1 occurs in Σ_{theory} but there are also non-value constructors of sort κ_1 , then let $V := \{(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A \mid s_1 \text{ is a variable}\}$ and $T := \{(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A \mid s_1 \text{ is not a variable in } \text{Var}(\varphi)\}$. Note that V and T overlap in cases where s_1 is a variable not occurring in φ . The result of the function is:

$$\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, V, \text{value}) \wedge \mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, T, \text{term})$$

In all cases, the recursive calls are defined, by the decrease in the third argument (and in the last case possibly also in the first and second argument).

- if $m > 0$ and $b = \text{value}$, then we assume that κ_1 occurs in Σ_{theory} and for all $(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A$ the first term, s_1 , is a variable (if not, we might define the function result as **false**, but this cannot occur in the algorithm). Then let x_{n+1} be a fresh variable of sort κ_1 , and let $A' := \{((s_2, \dots, s_m), \varphi[s_1 := x_{n+1}]) \mid ((s_1, \dots, s_m), \varphi) \in A\}$; the result is:

$$\mathbf{OK}((x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}), A', \text{either})$$

Note that A' has equally many function symbols as and fewer variables than A , and that we indeed have suitable sort sequences $(\iota_1, \dots, \iota_n, \kappa_1)$ for the variables and $\kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_m$ for the term sequences);

- if $m > 0$ and $b = \text{term}$ and for all $(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A$ the first term, s_1 , is a variable, then we assume (like we did in the previous case) that never $s_1 \in \varphi$, and let $A' := \{((s_2, \dots, s_m), \varphi) \mid ((s_1, \dots, s_m), \varphi) \in A\}$; the result is:

$$\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A', \text{either})$$

²⁰This parameter indicates what constructor instantiations we should consider for s_1 .

A' has at most as many function symbols as and fewer variables than A .

- if $m > 0$ and $b = \text{term}$ and there is some $(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A$ where s_1 is not a variable, then let $f_1, \dots, f_k$ be all non-value constructors with output sort κ_1 and let $A_1, \dots, A_k$ be defined as follows: $A_i := \{(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A \mid s_1 \text{ is a variable or has the form } f_i(\vec{t})\}$. Now, for all i : if f_i has sort declaration $[\mu_1 \times \dots \times \mu_p] \Rightarrow \kappa_1$, then we consider the new sort sequence $\vec{\kappa}'$ with $\vec{\kappa}' = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_m)$; for every $(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A_i$ we define:
 - if $s_1 = f_i(t_1, \dots, t_p)$, then $\vec{u} := (t_1, \dots, t_p, s_2, \dots, s_m)$ and $\psi := \varphi$
 - if s_1 is a variable, then let $y_1, \dots, y_p$ be fresh variables with sorts $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p$ respectively, and let $\vec{u} := (y_1, \dots, y_p, s_2, \dots, s_m)$ and $\psi := \varphi[s_1 := f_i(y_1, \dots, y_p)]$.

We let B_i be the set of the corresponding $(\vec{u}, \psi)$ for all $(\vec{s}, \varphi) \in A_i$. Now, if A_i contains any element where s_i is not a variable, then B_i contains fewer function symbols (not counting constraints), so also fewer than A (as $A_i \subseteq A$). If all s_i are variables, then A_i is a strict subset of A , which misses at least one element where s_i contains a symbol, so also B_i has fewer symbols. Either way, we are safe defining the result as:

$$\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, B_1, \text{either}) \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, B_k, \text{either})$$

LEMMA B.5. *For any suitable $n, m, \vec{v}, \vec{\kappa}, \vec{x}, b$ and A such that $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A, b) = \text{true}$, we have, for any sequence $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of values and any sequence $(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ of ground constructor terms: if one of the following conditions holds,*

- $b = \text{either}$ or $m = 0$
- $b = \text{value}$ and t_1 is a value
- $b = \text{term}$ and t_1 is not a value, and for all $((u_1, \dots, u_n), \varphi) \in A$: $u_1 \notin \text{Var}(\varphi)$

then there is some $((u_1, \dots, u_m), \varphi) \in A$ and a substitution γ with $\gamma(x_i) = s_i$ such that:

- each $t_i = u_i \gamma$
- $\varphi \gamma$ is a valid ground logical constraint

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A, b) = \text{true}$. Let values $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ and ground constructor terms $(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ which satisfy the conditions be given.

If $m = 0$, then let $\psi := \bigvee_{((\cdot), \varphi) \in A} \varphi$. By definition of $\mathbf{OK}$, we know that $\exists y_1 \dots y_k. \psi$ is valid and $\text{Var}(\psi) \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_k\}$. That is, there are values $v_1, \dots, v_k$ such that for all values $u_1, \dots, u_n$ the ground constraint $\psi[\vec{y} := \vec{v}, \vec{x} := \vec{u}]$ is valid. In particular, we can take $\vec{s}$ for $\vec{u}$. Define $\gamma := [y_1 := v_1, \dots, y_k := v_k, x_1 := s_1, \dots, x_n := s_n]$. Then $\psi \gamma$ is valid, and since $\psi \gamma$ is ground we can identify a valid part of the disjunction, so some $((\cdot), \varphi) \in A$ where $\varphi \gamma$ is a valid ground logical constraint. This is exactly what the lemma requires!

If $m > 0$ and $b = \text{either}$ and κ_1 does not occur in Σ_{theory} , then $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A, \text{term})$ holds. Since there are no values of sort κ_1 , the term t_1 is not a value; for the same reason, variables of sort κ_1 cannot occur in any constraint φ . Thus, the conditions for the induction hypothesis are satisfied; we find a suitable γ and $(\vec{u}, \varphi)$.

If $m > 0$ and $b = \text{either}$ and κ_1 does occur in Σ_{theory} , and all constructors with output sort κ_1 are values, then $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, A, \text{value})$ holds; moreover, t_1 is necessarily a value, so we can again apply the induction hypothesis.

If $m > 0$ and $b = \text{either}$ and there are both values and other constructors with output sort κ_1 , then both $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, T, \text{term})$ and $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, V, \text{value})$ must hold. If t_1 is a value, then the conditions to apply the induction hypothesis with V are satisfied; if not, the conditions to apply it with T are satisfied! Since both T and V are subsets of A , this results in a suitable element and substitution.

If $m > 0$ and $b = \text{value}$, then by the condition we can assume that t_1 is a value. Let x_{n+1} be a fresh variable of sort κ_1 , and $A' := \{((u_2, \dots, u_m), \varphi[u_1 := x_{n+1}]) \mid (\vec{u}, \varphi) \in A\}$. Thus, we can apply the induction hypothesis with $n + 1, m -$

1, $(\vec{u}, \kappa_1), (\kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_m), (x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}), A'$, either and $(s_1, \dots, s_n, t_1)$ and $(t_2, \dots, t_m)$. We obtain an element $(\vec{u}, \varphi) \in A'$ and γ such that $\gamma(x_i) = s_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\gamma(x_{n+1}) = t_1$ and each $t_{i+1} = u_i\gamma$, and $\varphi\gamma$ is a valid ground logical constraint. Now, $(\vec{u}, \varphi)$ can be written as $((w_2, \dots, w_n), \varphi'[w_1 := x_{n+1}])$ for some $(\vec{w}, \varphi') \in A$. So let δ be the substitution $\gamma \cup [w_1 := \gamma(x_{n+1})]$. Then, noting that by linearity w_1 may not occur in the other w_i , and that because x_{n+1} does not occur in φ' we have $\varphi'\delta = \varphi\gamma$, indeed each further $\delta(x_i) = \gamma(x_i) = s_i$ and $t_1 = \gamma(x_{n+1}) = \delta(w_1) = w_1\delta$ and $t_i = u_i\gamma = w_i\delta$ for larger i .

If $m > 0$ and $b = \text{term}$, then we can assume that t_1 is not a value. If all $(\vec{u}, \varphi) \in A$ have a variable for u_1 , then we use the induction hypothesis and find a suitable element $((u_2, \dots, u_m), \varphi) \in A'$ and substitution γ with $\gamma(x_i) = s_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that each $t_i = u_i\gamma$ ($i > 1$) and $\varphi\gamma$ is a valid ground logical constraint. Choose $\delta := \gamma \cup [u_1 := t_1]$ (this is safe by linearity). The same requirements are satisfied, and also $t_1 = u_1\delta$!

Finally, suppose $m > 0$ and $b = \text{term}$ and A has some element $(\vec{u}, \varphi)$ where u_1 is not a variable; by assumption it is also not a value. By the conditions, we may assume that always $u_1 \notin \text{Var}(\varphi)$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_k$ be all constructors in $\Sigma_{\text{terms}} \setminus \text{Val}$ with output sort κ_1 . Since also t_1 is not a value, but is a ground constructor term, it can only have the form $f_p(w_1, \dots, w_k)$ for some $p, \vec{w}$. Observing that $\mathbf{OK}(\vec{x}, B_p, \text{either})$ must hold, we use the induction hypothesis, for $\vec{x}, \vec{s}$ and $(w_1, \dots, w_k, t_2, \dots, t_m)$, and find both a suitable tuple $((q_1, \dots, q_k, u_2, \dots, u_m), \varphi) \in B_p$ and a substitution γ which respects φ , maps $\vec{x}$ to $\vec{s}$ and has $q_i\gamma = w_i$ and $u_j\gamma = t_j$ for all i, j .

By definition of B_p , we have $((u_1, \dots, u_m), \varphi) \in A$ for some u_1 which is either a variable (in which case all q_i are fresh variables), or $u_1 = f_p(q_1, \dots, q_k)$. In the case of a variable, u_1 cannot occur in any of the other u_i by the linearity requirement, nor in φ by the conditions. Thus, we can safely assume that u_1 does not occur in the domain of γ , and choose $\delta := \gamma \cup [u_1 := f(w_1, \dots, w_k)]$. Then $\varphi\delta = \varphi\gamma$ is still a valid ground constraint, each $s_i = x_i\gamma = x_i\delta$ and for $i > 1$ also $t_i = u_i\gamma = u_i\delta$. Finally, $t_1 = f_p(w_1, \dots, w_k) = u_1\delta$ as required. In the alternative case that $u_1 = f_p(q_1, \dots, q_k)$, we observe that γ already suffices: each $s_i = x_i\gamma$, for $i > 1$ we have $t_i = u_i\gamma$ and $t_1 = f_p(w_1, \dots, w_k) = f_p(q_1\gamma, \dots, q_k\gamma) = u_1\gamma$. $\square$

THEOREM B.6. *A left-linear and left-value-free constructor-sound LCTRS with rules $\mathcal{R}$ is quasi-reductive if for all defined and calculation symbols f : $\mathbf{OK}(), A_f, \text{either}$ holds, where $A_f := \{(\vec{\ell}, \varphi) \mid \ell \rightarrow r[\varphi] \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}} \wedge \ell = f(\vec{\ell})\}$.*

PROOF. By Lemma B.2 it suffices to prove that all terms of the form $f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ can be reduced, where f is a defined or calculation symbol and all s_i are constructor terms. This holds if there is a rule $f(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n) \rightarrow r[\varphi] \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{calc}}$ and a substitution γ such that each $s_i = \ell_i\gamma$ and $\varphi\gamma$ is a satisfiable constraint. By Lemma B.5 (which we can apply because left-hand sides of rules are linear and value-free), that's exactly the case if $\mathbf{OK}(), A_f, \text{either} = \text{true}$! $\square$

C. SIMPLE SUM

To demonstrate the difference in power between our technique and earlier work, even when not considering advanced data structures which were not supported in [Nakabayashi et al. 2010] or [Falke and Kapur 2012], we have included an example that can be handled with the technique in this paper (and is automatically proved by Ctrl), but not with [Nakabayashi et al. 2010] or [Falke and Kapur 2012] (the latter of which is not surprising, as it does not use any lemma generation at all).

Example C.1. In the programming course in Nagoya, students in the first lecture were asked to implement a function sum, which computes the summation from 0 to given a non-negative integer x . The teacher's reference implementation was:

```

int sum(int x) {
  int z = 0;
  for (int i = 1 ; i <= x; i++) {
    z += i;
  }
  return z;
}

```

Some of the students solved (or tried to solve) this in the clever way instead:

```

int sum1(int x) {
  return x * (x + 1) / 2;
}
int sum2(int x) {
  return x * (x - 1) / 2;
}

```

To stay close to the transformation from [Nakabayashi et al. 2010] (which does not use the return and error symbols), we consider the following translation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{sum}(x) &\rightarrow u(x, 1, 0) \\
 u(x, i, z) &\rightarrow u(x, i + 1, z + i) \quad [i \leq x] \\
 u(x, i, z) &\rightarrow z \quad [i > x] \\
 \text{sum1}(x) &\rightarrow x * (x + 1) \text{ div } 2 \\
 \text{sum2}(x) &\rightarrow x * (x - 1) \text{ div } 2
 \end{aligned}$$

Our implementation succeeds in proving that $\text{sum}(n) \approx \text{sum1}(n) \ [n \geq 0]$ is an inductive theorem and that $\text{sum}(n) \approx \text{sum2}(n) \ [n \geq 0]$ is not. We also succeed on the translation using the methods in the current paper. On the other hand, the method in [Nakabayashi et al. 2010] fails to prove/disprove these claims.